THEOLOGY

VOL. XXXVIII APRIL, 1939 No. 226

EDITORIAL

NEITHER the debate during the last session of the Church Assembly on the "Second Report of the Commission on Parochial Endowments"[1] nor the Report itself offers much encouragement to those who wish to believe that the Church in England is at present capable of self-reconstruction. It is not to be forgotten that just over a hundred years ago the Church had to be forced, or at least prodded, by the State into a reform of glaring financial and administrative abuses.[2] There are some who have already concluded that the Church as it is to-day will not reform itself until it is compelled to do so by active persecution. This grave conclusion may be justified; nevertheless, it would be lamentable if it were used as a pretext for postponing consideration of the principles which ought to control the reform of the Church in the present historical situation. It does not seem impossible that, if attention were fixed on the moral and spiritual principles underlying the economic or administrative issues, there might arise within the Church, even in the Church Assembly, a determination to set in action a process of radical reconstruction which would terminate the existing deadlock.

* * * * *

The Report and the debate upon it are disappointing, not so much because the Assembly has so far failed to commit itself to any decisive action, as because neither betrays a clear resolve to force the large questions of principle to a head. Some encouragement is no doubt to be derived from the absence of any advocacy of a policy of "no change," and there is one conspicuously bright spot in the Report. Four members of the Commission—but only four, out of a total of over forty—added at the end a Note (p. 25) which briefly raises the issues of first importance. It is

[1] C.A. 623; obtainable from the S.P.C.K., price 4d. [2] See F. W. Cornish, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century* (1910), vol. i, ch. 5.

significant that in the discussions of the Report, whether in the Church Assembly or elsewhere, scarcely any attention has been paid to this Note, and we make no apology, therefore, for calling attention to it now. The terms of reference of the Commission were as follows: " To consider the problems arising from the inequalities of parochial endowments, and to report what measures could be taken to produce a more equitable distribution of such endowments." Wider terms should have been demanded if these terms were not wide enough to allow the Commission to ask large questions; it need not have contented itself with answering small ones. In fact, it has taken for granted that the received ecclesiastical system is right in itself and is suited to contemporary conditions, and that all that is needed is the reform of certain anomalies and inequalities which at present invite adverse criticism. The Majority and Minority Reports differ only as to the means which they recommend of securing a more equitable distribution of endowments, and in the fact that the Minority Report wishes to be more tender to property rights at the cost of perpetuating irrational inequalities, but they agree in stopping short of the threshold of really subversive questions.

* * * * *

The four signatories of the protesting Note explain that they are able to sign the Report " since it is at least a first step towards a reform which is long overdue, and a serious attempt to deal with certain evils which obscure the Church's witness to Christian truth and hinder the work of evangelism to which it is called." But then they say that, in their judgment, it is an incomplete attempt, for two reasons. " The Commission has not gone far enough back for its principles, nor looked far enough ahead in its proposals." " The Commission has not asked itself the determining theological question, What is the character of Christian community, nor proceeded to consider how a society whose primary purpose is to evangelize men and women living in a secular order should use its resources of men and money most effectually." They attribute the failure of the Commission " to the small representation upon it of men whose formative experience has been in the post-war years." And they quote the following pertinent passage from the Report of the " Church and Community " Section of the Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State:

"The Church is not yet facing the new situation with sufficient frankness. With the conservative instincts of all institutions of long standing and influence it has fought a defensive—and on the whole a losing—battle for the maintenance of as much as possible of the old ideal of *Corpus Christianum* and of the privileges and authority which that implies. Such a policy is doubly mistaken . . . it is quite unrealistic . . . and the ideal, though magnificent, was mistaken and premature. . . . For the relationship of the Church to the Community, the mission field is now normative."

* * * * *

Many churchmen, possibly most, would give verbal assent to the opinion expressed in the last sentence. That England needs to be re-evangelized, and that the Church in England ought to become a missionary body, are commonplaces of current pulpit oratory which appear to evoke no objection in the pew. What we miss is a systematic attempt to envisage what changes are consequently required in every sphere of church organization, and then to inaugurate them. A Commission such as that appointed to consider the question of parochial endowments is not setting about its task in a right or realistic way unless it asks, in the first place, What is the true nature of the Church as a spiritual society? What is its permanent character as the body of Christ, which ought to determine its structure and organization through every variation of historical circumstance? And then, in the second place, What are the distinctive conditions of the present and impending historical situation to which the permanent character of the Church must be brought into dynamic relation? There is a certain number of conservative churchmen who are much occupied with the first of these questions, and there is a certain number of liberal churchmen who are much occupied with the second; there are too few who are equally occupied with both. What is most disconcerting about the Report of this Commission is its implication that a large majority of those who take a prominent part in the central administration and finance of the Church, and are frequently heard in the Church Assembly, can blithely propose measures of church reform without asking or trying to answer either of these questions.

* * * * *

If the Church Assembly, when first confronted with the problem of parochial endowments, had taken steps to initiate a general reconstruction of the church system on grounds both of spiritual principle and of historical realism, and if at the same time all its clerical members in possession of benefices of over a certain amount had decided during the transition period to submit to a voluntary tax of ten or even two per cent. on their stipends and to invite all other clerics similarly placed to do the same—the proceeds to be used for the benefit of the occupants of the most penurious benefices—we think that outsiders, and insiders too, would have rubbed their eyes and would have exclaimed: What on earth has happened to the Church of England? The value of some such interim measure would have been far more moral than financial. It would have marked the loosening of the stranglehold of conservative prudence and caution upon the minds of our administrators. It would have contained the promise of a new moral adventurousness in quarters where men have sadly ceased to look for it. It would have shown that the Church of England is, after all, capable of unexpected action.

* * * * *

What has been said about this matter of parochial endowments will be found to apply *mutatis mutandis* to other problems of church reform. There is a Commission which has been appointed by the Archbishops to consider a reform in the methods of training men for the ministry. Its personnel allows us to hope for better things from this Commission than from the other. The training of men for the ministry, even more than the use of parochial endowments, ought not to be considered except in subordination to the whole question of the purpose of the Church and its relation to the community to-day. A consistent attempt to get to the roots of either of these problems, or indeed of several others, might set in action the kind of movement within the Church which would enlist the allegiance of all who are eager to see the gospel of the Kingdom of God expressed anew in the organic life of the Christian society, however far-reaching the changes that this will involve in the existing system. It may be the case that the Church Assembly—not through the fault of its individual members, but by the logic of its constitution—is not an instrument that is capable of initiating this process.

A movement towards church reform would be welcome from whatever quarter it derived its initial impetus; but the means by which it would be carried through are not a matter of indifference. In fact, they raise issues of principle. To what extent is it consistent with the character of the Church that it should be controlled by a centralized bureaucracy? Will dependence on that deprive the diocese and its bishop or the local Christian congregation and its minister of a power of independent initiative which is a necessary part of their spiritual character? It must be recognized that the present, and apparently inevitable, tendency of the secular order is towards thoroughgoing centralization and "a planned society"; it is argued that, if under these conditions scope is to be preserved for personal freedom, it can be only as a consequence of planning for that purpose.[1] Is this argument valid for the Church also? If centralization is necessary for efficiency in a machine society, ought the Church to make the fullest possible use of sociological techniques in its own administration? Or is this kind of centralization so inconsistent with the true character of the Church that whatever the consequences it must be resisted? This question is, of course, of much wider application than to the problem of parochial endowments. It may be expressed by asking whether the new Church House at Westminster, which aspires, in the words of the Bishop of Portsmouth, "to provide an increasing centre of church effort so that the new building may fully justify the statement that it is the business headquarters of the Church of England," ought to fill us with feelings of hope or of foreboding.

[1] See, *e.g.*, Christopher Dawson's new book, *Beyond Politics* (Sheed and Ward, 3s. 6d.).

Dogmatic Theology

In order to reach any just notion of the function and value of dogmatic theology, it is first necessary to remove prejudices arising from the popular use of the word "dogma." Somewhere in one of her essays (I cannot now trace the reference) Miss Rose Macaulay has pointed out how often we use two substantives to denote the same thing, the one if we disapprove of it, the other if we do not. Thus "traffic" denotes the same thing as "trade," but generally we use the word "traffic" of trades of which we disapprove. We commonly speak of "the White Slave Traffic" and sometimes of "the Drink Traffic," but never of "the Boot Traffic," only of "the Boot Trade." In common speech the difference between "dogma" and "doctrine" is exactly analogous to that between "traffic" and "trade." "Dogma" means a religious doctrine which the speaker does not approve of or does not believe in. Thus "liberal" Christians commonly talk about "the dogma of the Virgin Birth" and about "the doctrine of the Incarnation," indicating thereby simply that they reject the former and accept the latter. This use of language obviously creates a quite irrational prejudice against everything which the term "dogmatic theology" is supposed to stand for.

A further source of misconception is the quite vague but prevalent impression that "dogma," like the sacrifice of animals, somehow belongs to a relatively primitive stage of religion, but that the Catholic Church could not rid itself of the obscurantism inseparable from priestcraft sufficiently to abandon dogma when it abandoned sacrifices. In point of fact dogma properly so called, whatever its merits or demerits, is a distinctive product of the Christian religion. This point calls for further examination if the function of dogmatic theology is to be justly appreciated.

On the whole, primitive religion cares more for correctness of ritual observance than for truth or sincerity of personal belief. It teaches certain ceremonial methods of approaching the gods, which must be scrupulously followed if certain desirable results are to be attained. No doubt a belief is implied that the prescribed methods really are effective; and priests may have a short way with sceptics who challenge them on the point. But what they are chiefly concerned to maintain is the obligatoriness of a

particular ritual; and as long as the individual punctually fulfils what is enjoined in the way of outward observance, his personal beliefs about the nature of the gods, if he has any which are distinct from the accepted tradition, are his own concern. The whole centre of primitive religion is cultus rather than creed. Moreover, at this primitive level the idea is very generally accepted that practical efficacy is after all the great test of value in cultus. Thus a conquered tribe or nation is often very ready to accept the cultus of its conquerors, since this cultus has given substantial proof that it is efficacious.

It is evident that this whole temper of mind and attitude to religion in general is such as to promote the coexistence and fusion of many different religious beliefs and practices in a polytheistic culture or civilization And the polytheism of ancient Greece and Rome, which was the result of such a fusion, certainly exhibited in civilized times a wide measure of toleration in matters of religious belief. In Athens of the fifth century B.C., it is true, there is an appearance of something like dogma in the state-religion, when Socrates was condemned for atheism. But in the home of the sophists and of Aristophanes few can have taken that charge very seriously; and under the authority of the Roman Empire freedom of personal belief and its expression was practically unlimited. Persecution of the Christians for non-conformity in the matter of emperor-worship was indeed religious persecution, but it was not based on the authority of any creed or dogma. Philosophers of the heathen world who were sympathetic to popular religion readily came to the conclusion that the multifarious deities of the pantheon were different manifestations of the one divine reality which was the ultimate ground of the universe. Thus tolerant polytheism naturally passes into some type of the pantheism which shows such protean variety of form in east and west. The modern counterpart of this development is seen in the various movements towards a world-fellowship of religions, in which all the participants recognize that their own particular religion is but a partial apprehension of some vague truth which includes and transcends them all.

In marked opposition to this general line of religious evolution stands the history of Judaism recorded in the Bible. From very early times the Hebrew tribes, or at any rate their religious leaders, held the singular belief that they were bound by covenant in a quite special manner to their

national god, the God of Israel. Their God was a jealous God and demanded an altogether exclusive allegiance from His people, and this exclusive demand was joined with an equally absolute promise of glorious deliverance and salvation. Accordingly, when notions of the Godhead came to be universalized, the Hebrew prophets rejected any fusion or conjunction of the worship of Jehovah with that of other gods. They declared on the contrary that Jehovah, the God of Israel, was the sole Creator of the world and absolute sovereign among all gods, that the gods of other nations were powerless to save and deliver, and finally that they were mere idols, bits of wood and stone, with no spiritual or living existence at all. The disastrous fortunes of the Hebrew people were put down to sin, which in the prophetic religion meant pre-eminently failure in personal or national obedience and trust towards Jehovah the only Saviour. And from the time of the Captivity onwards, if not before, a belief appears that, since Jehovah is the only true God of all the world, His promise is not to Israel only, but that in and through Israel all the nations of the earth are finally to be blessed. Thus in Judaism alone we find the germs of a religion which is at once catholic, evangelical and dogmatic.

Salvation is from the Jews, and out of Judaism Christianity was born. What then is Christianity? The liberal theology of the last century fatally obscured the true answer to this question by ignoring the Jewish ancestry of the faith which it professed to interpret. There is no doubt what the life, death and resurrection of Jesus primarily meant to the Christians of the first generation. They meant that now at length the living God had by a mighty and final act fulfilled His ancient promise to His people. "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for He hath visited and redeemed His people, and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of His servant David." The Benedictus strikes the keynote of original Christianity. The first preaching of the apostles was that "Jesus is the Christ," the promised Messiah of Israel: the Christians constituted the new and the true Israel living under a new dispensation now that the Messiah had come, had suffered and died and risen again to deliver God's people from sin, and would shortly return in glory to consummate God's kingdom in the world to come. Of course such a statement could only be the beginning, not the whole, of the Christian message. The fact that the Messiah was none other than Jesus of Nazareth trans-

formed and deepened immeasurably all men's idea of Messiahship and of what the fulfilment of God's promises really meant. There was in the life and teaching of Jesus a new revelation of God which demanded the recognition that Jesus was Himself God as well as Man. But this revelation was for ever inseparable from the fact that the life of Jesus was God's own promised act of deliverance and redemption for His people and for mankind. God's love and grace had been made known as historically operative and triumphant through the life, the humiliation unto death, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The truth revealed could not have been the truth at all, if it had not been *thus* revealed in historical fact as the fulfilment of God's promise.

Thus it comes about that the essence of the Christian religion is in a quite peculiar and unique sense a *gospel*, a message of good news about something that has happened. It is not simply a new teaching about God's nature, nor simply a new spiritual experience of communion with God, though it includes both of these. The new teaching and the new experience are made possible only by the fact that through certain events connected with Jesus, culminating in His crucifixion and resurrection, God has delivered man from sin and death, and now offers to all who believe the message of that deliverance and victory a new and heavenly life in fellowship with Christ. Because the gospel is good news concerning facts, it must be attested and declared by witnesses to those facts, and it can only be accepted by the faith which trusts their witness. In the nature of the case the truth of the gospel cannot be grasped merely by abstract reasoning, nor yet merely by the spiritual insight which in all ages has striven to penetrate behind phenomena to the being of God. Both reason and spiritual insight may prepare the mind and heart to accept the message when it is heard; but, as St Paul said, it cannot be heard unless there is a preacher sent to declare it. The Christian Church can only be catholic because it is first apostolic.

Having thus indicated the original character of the Christian religion, we begin to be in a position to understand what is the proper function of dogmatic theology within it. The gospel, which the Christian Church exists to proclaim, essentially consists in a message concerning certain facts and their meaning in reference to God and man. The essence of the message must remain identically the same as long as the mission of the Church endures. But it

does not follow that the *whole* meaning of the gospel facts was explicitly apparent from the first day that the gospel was preached. Christ's promise of the Spirit as Interpreter and Guide into all the truth itself suggests the contrary. The meaning of the original message must become clearer and fuller as it makes contact with an ever-widening range and variety of thoughts, ideas, and experiences. The task, then, for the apostolic Church is to maintain intact and unchanged the essence of the original message, while at the same time it interprets it afresh to meet ever-new and ever-changing situations in the life of the world. And the task is complicated by the fact that words themselves inevitably change their meanings to some extent in the course of historical development, so that the repetition of the same form of words as a confession of faith is not by itself a guarantee that they are repeated with the same meaning or that the faith which they express is the same.

Let us now venture on a definition. A dogma is a pronouncement upon the essential content of the Christian message made by the Church or its representatives in virtue of the apostolic authority inherent in the Church. Dogmatic theology is the further exposition and discussion of the meaning and implications of such pronouncements. Dogma is in no way to be opposed to gospel as though the former sought to substitute mere assent for the living faith required by the latter. On the contrary, a dogma is a formulation designed to declare and safeguard the essence of the gospel to be believed in. Again, dogma as such no more limits the freedom of the intellect than does the gospel. On the contrary, it assists that freedom. For if there is no clear understanding of what the gospel is—and it is the purpose of dogma to make that understanding possible—the intellect cannot exercise its freedom either in accepting or in rejecting it. Chaos and confusion are no more the friends of liberty in the intellectual than in the political sphere. A dogma which obscures the meaning of the gospel is a bad dogma. Of course, if the Church exercises its apostolic authority *infallibly*, it must be held that a bad dogma is not really a dogma at all. On the other hand, only if the Church has no apostolic authority can it be held that a dogma is necessarily bad.

It will be noticed that, if the suggested definitions of dogma and dogmatic theology be accepted, considerable room is left for discussions and interpretations of the Christian faith,

which, although theological, are not strictly dogmatic. Dogmatic theology is concerned with the exposition of what, as Catholic theologians say, is strictly *de fide*—*i.e.*, what belongs to the enduring essence of the Christian gospel and the Christian revelation. The aim of dogma is to safeguard this essence of the faith by distinguishing it both from false interpretations which would pervert its meaning and from interpretations which are matters of opinion, possibly true but not to be taught or proclaimed with the full authority of the apostolic Church. But theology may be written or spoken with the purpose, not of defining and safeguarding what is essential, but of further expounding or commending the Christian faith either to those who already hold it or to those who are prevented from holding it by the misunderstandings and doubts current at a particular time. Such theological exposition is not strictly dogmatic, nor need it be, in the proper sense, apologetic. It is best known by the general name of "systematic" theology.

It must, however, be admitted that this distinction between dogmatic and systematic theology is not generally recognized. In the Protestant Churches what is called systematic theology generally takes the place of dogmatic, whereas in the classifications of theology in the Roman Catholic Church "systematic theology" finds no place at all. There are historical and theological reasons for this difference. A belief in the infallibility of the pope naturally encourages the idea that the Church's dogma constantly extends its frontiers as Christian history proceeds. The implicit meaning of the Christian revelation gradually becomes more and more explicit as time goes on, and as this happens an ever-wider area of truth is included under the dogma which infallibly states what is essential to the gospel and may not be questioned on pain of heresy. This conception of the progress of dogma is inevitably discouraging to any adventurousness in the field of systematic theology. The two greatest systematic theologians in the history of the Church are Origen and St Thomas Aquinas. Origen was found after his death to be a heretic. The teachings of St Thomas, on the other hand, have almost been accepted as the standard of dogmatic orthodoxy. One fate or other is almost bound to overtake the systematic theologian in the Church of Rome who ventures at all outside the sphere of what is dogmatically defined. And in proportion as that sphere is extended, there is less and less room to go beyond it and more and

more temerity in the attempt. Thus in the Church of Rome, since the Reformation, systematic theology has been almost entirely absorbed by dogmatic.

The Protestant Churches appealed to the Bible against the development of dogma, and naturally the reaction tended to be extreme. Protestantism has tried to preach the gospel, while disallowing the authority of the Church to define its content and essential implications. The attempt can hardly be said to have been altogether justified by its results. The modern student of the Bible, when he tries as a systematic theologian to relate its message to the thought of the contemporary world, finds himself confronted by a bewildering mass of conflicting philosophies and systems of ideas. Unchecked by any authority of dogma, and eager to interpret the gospel to the men of his own age, he is only too likely to snatch hastily at some superficial "reconciliation of Christianity with modern thought," which misses the essential meaning both of the one and of the other, and in the end only aggravates confusion. Hence the tragic failure of the "Liberal Protestantism,"[1] which only a generation ago seemed to many to bring a new revelation of God. To-day Liberalism is almost as dead in theology as it is in politics. Warned by its fate, the most influential school of Protestant theology has now come to the conclusion that it is impossible to translate the message of the Bible into any forms of thought or methods of expression other than its own. Theology thus becomes simply a department of exegesis, and all thought about God which is not derived from faith in the biblical revelation is dismissed as merely false. The systematic theology based on these principles cannot allow the gospel to be catholic at all; for it is compelled to maintain that there is nothing good in the common mind and heart of man to which the gospel can appeal. The good news can only be heard by the elect to whom God has already granted the special gift of faith. The Bible thus appears as catholic only in its denunciations.

The Church of England characteristically has never clearly taken a side on the broad issue just stated between the Roman Catholic conception of dogma and the Protestant

[1] I am seeking to account only for the *failure* of Liberal Protestantism. What makes its failure so tragic is precisely the value of its contribution to Christian theology. The same kind of qualification applies to what follows about "Barthianism."

exaltation of the Bible as the sole authority in matters of faith. Its formularies indeed maintain that nothing must be taught as "necessary to salvation" (*i.e.*, essential to the gospel) which cannot be proved from Scripture, and they reject the notion of any infallibility inherent either in the office of the Papacy or in the General Councils of the Church. On the other hand, the Church of England firmly professes its acceptance of the creeds, which are, in some part at least, clearly dogmatic formulations; and the characteristic appeal of Anglican theologians to the teaching of the Fathers and of the undivided Church seems to imply the authority of some dogmatic tradition.

On the whole it seems fair to say that Anglican orthodoxy recognizes the authority of dogma, but interprets it in a different way from that which is characteristic of Roman Catholicism. The difference goes much deeper than a mere difference as to the particular dogmas to be accepted. Anglicanism regards it as the function of dogma, not to *extend* the frontiers of the truth defined as essential to faith, but only to safeguard by necessary definition the permanent identity of the gospel message which the apostolic Church was originally commissioned to declare. In this connexion Anglican theologians in recent times have been increasingly inclined to emphasize the *negative* value of the dogmatic decisions of ecumenical Councils, and have represented them as primarily intended to exclude heresies which would destroy the gospel by false explanation, rather than to give an exclusive authority to any theoretic or philosophical interpretation of the gospel message. Thus, for instance, the statement drawn up at Chalcedon, together with the documents which that Council approved, on the subject of the two natures and one person of Jesus Christ, are authoritative not as implying one particular theory or philosophical interpretation of the mystery in question, but rather as excluding certain interpretations already put forward which had proved themselves misleading and injurious. It was the main intention of the Council to declare that doctrines which implicitly deny either the unity of Christ's person or the full reality either of His deity or of His humanity are to be rejected; it was not its intention to commit the Church to any particular theory of the way in which the unity of the person and the duality of the natures are to be understood.

If this position is to be accepted as in principle sound,

both the value and the limitations of dogmatic theology become apparent. Dogma is not gospel, nor is gospel dogma; and it is the gospel which really matters. But because it is the gospel which matters, dogma is needed to save its mystery from " explanations " which would destroy or corrupt it. Dogmatic theology, then, deals with the meaning and value of creeds or dogmas in relation to the gospel. It thus aims at answering the question: what beliefs must necessarily be accepted or rejected by every loyal and faithful member of the Church? It leaves to systematic theology the further task of answering the question: what is the best way of interpreting positively the content of the gospel faith in relation to current ideas and philosophies? Dogmatic theology sets the limits within which systematic theology must move. If dogmatic theology draws those limits too narrowly or extends unduly the authority of dogma, the result is the stagnation of orthodox thought. If, on the other hand, systematic theology ignores dogmatic, the result is either a superficial " modernism " which loses the essence of the gospel in professing to restate it, or else a narrow devotion to the Bible which, for fear of adulterating the gospel, will not suffer it to make positive contact with the intellectual life of the contemporary world.

The gospel endures and is never silent while Christ lives. It is the task of the Church's theology to help men to preach that message clearly and to hear and understand its meaning. Today that task is not being performed as it should, nor even as it might be. Perhaps the intellectual remedy for the confusion and sterility which have overtaken theology in modern Christendom lies partly in a clear distinction between dogmatic and systematic theology and of the need and value of both.

O. C. Quick.

Vexilla Regis: Some Reflections for Passiontide, 1939

" Father, the hour is come." Thus in the night of His betrayal the Christ, with eyes raised unto His Father, commences the solemn act of priestly intercession, which is itself the inauguration of His Passion. And for the Christian, whose piety must ever be moulded by that of the

Body of which he is, by baptism, a member, the coming of Holy Week brings with it ever anew a sense that the hour is indeed come, that hour when of His own choice the Messiah goes forth to stand alone before Pilate, and, in the hour of His condemnation, Himself to judge the world that rejected Him.

We can and must focus our attention upon the tragedy of the Cross. The symbolism of the three languages of the superscription is too obvious for comment. The wisdom of Greece, the piety of Israel and the justice of Rome unite in mockery of the Man of Sorrows. The bankruptcy of all human achievement, the disintegration of nature apart from grace, call it what you will—but there all may see its fruits. *Regnavit a ligno Deus*—so we sing in the office-hymn of Passiontide. But from His throne, albeit one of mercy, whence He cries, " Father, forgive," we are none the less judged, and our achievement exhibited as what, as the ineluctable consequence of Adam's choice, it has become. The tragedy of the Cross is not the tragedy of Christ, but of man. We cannot hope to know ourselves, unless we remember that revelation tells us that we crucified Him, who is of one substance with the Father.

But the Cross is at the same time the setting of God's achievement. In the *Pange Lingua* of Venantius Fortunatus, and in the Latin Preface for Passiontide, the song is of the ingenuity of God, the master-strategist, who has bound the Strong One. Thus in the Preface—*Qui salutem humani generis in ligno Crucis constituisti, ut unde mors oriebatur, inde vita resurgeret; et qui in ligno vincebat, in ligno quoque vinceretur.* The awful Reproaches of Good Friday likewise acclaim the strength of the Crucified, *sanctus, fortis—hagios, ischyros.* And again the classic paradox of the *Exultet—O certe necessarium Adæ peccatum, quod Christi morte deletum est! O felix culpa, quæ talem ac tantum meruit habere Redemptorem!* It is the triumphal acclamation, by the people of God, of their Lord, who has made their own rejection of His grace the means whereby their salvation might be accomplished.

The hour is come. We do well to stress its particularity. For that act of God, wrought out by Christ in flesh and blood, is of its nature incapable of repetition. The Incarnation, wherein the Word was made flesh, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by the taking of the manhood into God, belongs in a sense to the past. *Et incarnatus est,* we sing in the Liturgy, making mention of

her by name, in whose virgin womb by the operation of the Holy Ghost He was conceived. Of no chance, fortuitous intercourse is Messias the fruit, but of the response of Israel in the person of the mother of Jesus to the age-long divine selectivity. The *Ecce ancilla Domini* is the fruit of Yahweh's travail with His people. In the fulness of time He came, and on a day was born. So, too, on a day He enters Jerusalem in triumph, and on another day goes forth condemned. All these events are open to the normal methods of empirical constatation. They are particular occurrents. And we err grievously, if we seek to find their significance in some universal truth that they embody. They are themselves in their particularity the act of God, whence alone our redemption and adoption as sons of God depend. "Had Jesus never bled and died"—we shrink from such crudities. But that, and nothing less, is the gospel.

None the less, if the Passion of Christ is the act of God, the measure of the divine achievement, and of the tragedy of man, it is, as it were, the pattern of action pre-eminently proposed to those who by baptism are made members of His Body, and who, by participation in the life of that Body, share in His relation to the Father. The causality of Christ's redemptive act is unique, but we may perhaps (by a legitimate employment of the sovereign theological principle of analogy) legitimately attribute an analogous causality to the Church's *marturia*. For the Messiah Himself in the hour of His Passion proclaimed that in intention, in part at least, it was a martyrdom unto the truth, and in so far as the Church in her individual members accepts the fulness of her vocation she is actively participant in the Passion of her Lord.

In every Eucharist the death of Christ is shown forth sacramentally, and we are made partakers of His merits and His life. But in the liturgical cycle of Lent and Passiontide, the rejection and the Passion of the Son of Man are presented to us, as it were, no longer as the ground of our access to the Father and the source of our reconciliation and sanctification, but as a series of historical events. In our approach to the Eucharist, though it is through the sacramental oblation of Christ's sacrifice that we do honour to the Father, acknowledging His sovereign dominion, inevitably we think more of the substance of that offering than of the accidents of its historical (or sacramental)

embodiment. Yet in Passiontide we are led by the sovereign wisdom of the Church to attend to the individual details of that supreme confrontation of the Light of God with the darkness of this world. We realize that in that moment, when the fallen natural order was so mightily invaded by the transcendent majesty of God, and the powers of darkness overthrown in the agony of Gethsemane and Calvary, it was through the action of particular historical individuals that the full strength of the kingdom of Satan assailed the kingdom that came in Jesus. Judas, Pilate, Caiaphas are concrete, historical individuals. They are not, as so many well-intentioned Holy Week addresses suggest, merely abstract types of pride, compromise, envy. For, if we treat them so, we lose altogether the insight that the Passion would afford us into the historical mission of the Body of Christ.

In his profound meditations on the Mystery of the Church,[1] Père Humbert Clérissac, O.P. (who deserves our gratitude to-day, if only as a determining influence on the spiritual and intellectual development of M. Jacques Maritain), suggests that the whole mystery of the Church lies in the equation and convertibility of these two terms: Christ and the Church. Through that Church in the divine purposes is universal redemption to be accomplished, the Church herself finding her accomplishment in the consummation of that redemption. And it is in the concrete actuality of historical situations that redemption is to be accomplished.

It is in the divine society that is His Mystical Body that the work of Christ is accomplished. We are not His members of our own choice. We are bought with a price, incorporate into Him that we may know the fulness of His Baptism. For until that Baptism be accomplished, like Him, we are straitened and constrained. In each of us, and in the whole Body, the dialectic of nature and grace pursues its course. In the imperfection of the members the glory of the Head struggles to disclose itself. And, if in Passiontide we acknowledge in humbleness our gratitude to Him who has made us through His Passion sons of God, in our contrition we must acknowledge our wilful ignorance, our blind, brutal and deliberate refusal to recognize the dread vocation to which, through that sonship, bought at so great a price, we are called.

We have betrayed the vocation of the people of God. Yet still we are His people. And assuredly the Liturgy and office of Passiontide, speaking to us of that crisis of all history,

[1] A English translation was published by Sheed and Ward in 1937.

when in the darkness of Golgotha our redemption was mightily accomplished, constitute an almost overwhelming indictment of the members of that Body, which is the fruit of Christ's redeeming work. It is a reproach, for it is the proclamation of the sovereignty of God in Christ, through whom all things were made, over the series of historical events. It is the declaration that in the concrete actuality of particular historical occasions is the arm of the Lord laid bare and His Word proclaimed in judgment and denunciation, but, through rejection, in mercy.

It is for the *marturia* of the Church that the world cries. For, in her mission, as guardian of the divine revelation, she is also the protectress of "heathen things." Without grace, of which she is the vessel, nature disintegrates. That sovereign truth, which is the premise of the Church's concern with the social order,[1] is terribly manifest in the agony of the world around us. As we enter on Passiontide, we do not leave behind us the memory of Abyssinia, of Spain, of China, of Munich, of the sufferings of the ancient people of God, of the "neglected areas" in our own land. Rather we know that the fault is ours. For, as members of that Body, ours is the vocation to redemption and sanctification. Our baptism is our own crucifixion. For in the historical moment of the present, it is the accomplishment of that baptism, which is the condition of the restoration of all things in Christ.

It is to understand the work of God *sub specie historiæ* that we must strive in the solemnities of this Holy Week. As we watch with Him through the silent hours of Maundy Thursday night, let us remember that we too are called in this day, in a manner relative to the historic occasion of the moment, to drink of the chalice of the Messianic woe. That, and nothing less, is our vocation. And only in the strength of His victory over the powers of darkness can we hope to find that steadfast faith without which we cannot but fail, and that utter charity towards all men without which our actions are nothing worth. We are to manifest in our day, in our conformity with the ordinance of our redemption, the truth of God that the world may know that the Father sent the Son to be its saviour, in His Passion the cause of its restoration. And

[1] On this whole subject *cf.* Verriele, *Le surnaturel en nous et le péché originel* (Librairie Bloud et Gay).

that we can only hope to do, in so far we are dead to ourselves, and alive to Him alone, whose alone is the victory over the powers of darkness.

Vexilla regis prodeunt,
Fulget crucis mysterium.

D. M. MACKINNON.

The Light of Reason

IN the earlier chapters of his "Discourse of the Light of Nature," Culverwel outlines his conception of natural law.[1] He believed that in each man's mind there were some innate moral principles which, taken together, make up a moral law for man's nature. The contents of this law, and also its authority, were derived from God; and the law was made known to man mainly through his reason. Reason, therefore, is the light of man's nature, the candle of the Lord with which he searches for his true self. The second part of the Discourse is a prose poem written in praise of reason, and extensive quotations alone can give some faint picture of its thoughtfulness and beauty.

The first three chapters of this second part outline the limitations of reason. It comes from God and borrows its light from Him; it cannot tell us all we want to know, and therefore makes us desire God, who knows all; nor can it fathom the future. The belief that the source of reason is divine suggests some deep questions about the purpose of God, the origin of the soul, and the nature of its knowledge.

"All created excellency shines with borrowed beams; so that Reason is but *Scintilla divinæ lucis*. This was the very end, why God framed intellectual creatures, that he might communicate more of Himself to them, than He could to other inferior beings, and that they might return into the bosom of the first and supreme Cause, by such operations, as should in some measure imitate and represent the workings of God Himself.

"This moved Him to stamp upon some creatures understanding and will, which in themselves make up one simple

[1] See THEOLOGY (March, 1939), "Nathanael Culverwel—a Cambridge Platonist."

and entire print and signature of reason, though we break the seal for the better opening of them, and part them into two several notions. To this end He filled the highest part of the world with those stars of the first magnitude, I mean those orient and angelical beings, that dwell so near the fountain of light, and continually drink in the beams of glory; that are exactly conformable to their Creator in all His motions; for the same end He furnished and beautified this lower part of the world with intellectual lamps, that should shine forth to the praise and honour of His name, which totally have their dependance upon Him, both for their being, and for their perpetual continuation of them in their being. 'Twas He that lighted up these lamps at first; 'tis He that drops the golden oil into them" (pp. 71, 72).[1]

In what way is the light of reason derived from God? Plato and Origen thought that the soul existed before it came into this world. Plato will tell us:

"That there were a goodly company of lamps, a multitude of candles, a set number of souls lighted up altogether, and afterwards sent into bodies, as into so many dark lanthorns. This flock and treasure of souls was reserved and cabinetted in I know not what stars; perhaps that they might better calculate their own incarnation, the time when they were to descend into bodies" (p. 72).

Origen went further, and suggested that the worth of any particular soul determined the dignity of the body which it was to inhabit. From such teaching came the belief that the soul was accustomed to contemplation before birth, and that it brought some of its old notions through the forgetfulness which attended its incarnation. These beliefs were the groundwork of the platonic theory of knowledge, which Culverwel rejects together with the doctrine of the soul's pre-existence. He preferred to follow Aristotle, who would not admit that the soul brought from another world a cargo of its own notions.

"Do but analyze your own thoughts; tell us whence it was that light first sprang in upon you. Had you such notions as these when you first peeped into being? at the first opening of the soul's eye? in the first exordium of infancy? had you these connate species in the cradle? and were they rocked asleep with you? or did you then

[1] The numbers of the pages here and throughout the article refer to the 1669 edition.

meditate upon these principles? You plainly have recourse to sensitive powers, and must needs subscribe to this, that all knowledge comes flourishing in at these lattices" (p. 74).

Culverwel shows some anxiety to dissociate himself from pantheism. The soul is not part of God's being, though it was made in His image; it was created out of nothing. Many ancient authors had speculated more closely upon the circumstances of the soul's origin, and had raised some questions which were easier to ask than to answer. Was each soul lit immediately by God, or was its light kindled from the souls of its parents? Culverwel collects an astonishing crowd of opinions on this matter, and carefully refrains from stating his own. But he insists that either view is consistent with belief in the soul's immortality. The chapter ends with an eloquent description of the Divine Reason, and an exhortation to imitate it as far as may be.

"Does God Himself work according to reason from eternity to eternity? And has He made a creature in time whose very essence is reason? Why then does it not open its eyes? Why does it not use its lamp? and though it cannot discover all, yet let it discern as much as it can. Let it not act in the choicest points of religion out of blind and implicit principles. This neither becomes sons of light, nor works of light. The more men exercise their reason, the more they resemble God Himself" (p. 98).

God did not give men reason to beget pride, but He gave them some knowledge that they might desire more.

"A candle has no such goodly light, as that it should pride and glory in it. How far distant is it from the beauty of a star? How far from the brightness of the sun? Adam in innocency was not to crown himself with his own sparks. God never intended that a creature should rest satisfied with its own candle-light, but that it should run to the fountain of light, and sun itself in the presence of its God" (p. 99).

An eloquent description of Adam's happiness, of the state of bliss which would attend ideal human nature were it not fallen, is adorned by speculations as to how long Adam enjoyed that happiness and why he lost it. It may be that Culverwel thought of this happy and original state as historical; yet he did not tell the story for its historical interest, but as an expression of his view of human nature. Adam in innocency is a portrait of man as he was intended to be, and of man as by God's grace he might become.

Fallen Adam then gives place to the puzzled pagan philosophers, who lamented the consequences, even if they did not understand the circumstances, of his disaster. For they also confess the weakness of human reason.

"You may see Socrates in the twilight, and lamenting his obscure and benighted condition, and telling you that his lamp will show him nothing but his own darkness. You may see Plato sitting down by the waters of Lethe, and weeping because he could not remember his former notions. Look upon the most speculative eagles that stare the sun in the face, that fly highest in contemplation, those that love to sport and play in the light; yet at length, you may see the sun striking them through with one of his glorious darts, and chastising their inquisitive eyes with one of his brightest beams" (p. 104).

Men have always desired to foretell the future, but foreknowledge belongs not to angels or to men, but only to God. Such a plain statement of the limitations of reason was wholesome when many who were more confident than truthful claimed to be inspired. The theme is varied by some light ridicule of soothsayers, augurs, astrologers, chiromancers, and members of other and similar professions with which his reading had acquainted him.

"Men long for the greenest apples, for the precocious knowledge of events, before they are come to their just ripeness and maturity. The desire of this sets the astrologer a-lighting his candle at the stars. O how doth he flatter himself in his own imaginary twinklings? and how doth he persuade the more simple and credulous part of the world that he can put those capital stars, those golden letters together, and spell out the fates of kingdoms and persons? It makes the augur chatter with birds in their own dialect. O how devoutly will he listen to a prophetical crow? how will he criticize upon the harsh accents of the screech owl? upon the dismal and melancholy notes of the night raven?" (p. 110).

This sketch of the limitations of reason is completed in the remainder of the Discourse by the details of its beauty. Culverwel argues, as against the sceptics, that the light of reason is certain, as far as it goes. To those who are fettered by the past, he says that reason may often be a better guide than tradition. He tells those who are disturbed by its intrusion in theology that it will live peaceably with faith. To the Epicureans he says that true pleasure cannot be

had without reason; its light is therefore pleasant. And finally, the light of reason is ascendant, since it leads to union with God.

The most unkind words in the book are for the sceptic. We should like to know whether Culverwel had ever met a man who seriously doubted the truth of all that claimed to be knowledge; his sceptic, at first sight, appears to be an inhabitant only of the library. But some seventeenth-century dons had a polite habit of partly disguising their enemy in classical dress before they criticized him. The sceptic, says our author, is not fit to be honoured with the name of man, and boasts—

" an intellectual kind of continence and virginity, to keep his mind pure and untouched, whenas other understandings were ravished and deflowered with every wanton opinion " (p. 118).

The sceptics refused to admit the truth of first principles.

" They tell you they are only some artificial pillars, which some faint and tired understandings have set up for themselves to lean upon. If you tell them that common notions shine with their native light, with their own proper beams, all they will return will be this, that perhaps you think so, but they do not " (p. 119).

After giving a catalogue of the most famous sceptics, and a battery of questions meant to lay their shades, Culverwel expounds, in an interesting passage, his own theory of knowledge and of certainty. The limited certainty of our reason is God's gift; He alone has complete certainty, and He will not ultimately deceive us, especially in our knowledge of His own nature.

" God Himself must needs be the fountain of certainty as of all perfections. Created beings show their face for a while, their colour comes and goes. God is the only durable object of the soul. Now that the soul may have a satisfactory enjoyment of its God, and that it may be accurately made according to His image, God stamps and prints, as resemblances of His other perfections, so this of certainty upon it. How else should it know the mind of its God?" (p. 122).

In accordance with the theory of knowledge which he has previously developed, Culverwel attributes more certainty to the senses than to the mind. That is not what we should expect from a platonist, and it shows that the title Cambridge Platonist is sometimes more convenient than

accurate. Culverwel thought that Plato had laid himself open to the charge of scepticism, by placing all his security in—

" some uncertain, airy, and imaginary castles of his own contriving, and building, and fortifying. His connate ideas, I mean, which Aristotle could not at all confide in, but was fain to search for certainty somewhere else; and casting his eye upon the ground, he spied the bottom of it lying in sense, and laid there by the wise dispensation of God Himself" (p. 124).

A high estimate of the worth of reason will often lead to a strong sense of the duty of private judgment. Culverwel does not deny the value of authority in learning and in religion, but he insists that no authority save the Scriptures should be blindly followed. God expects men to use the reason which He has given them; " an eye open is more acceptable to God than an eye shut."

In spite of his own respect for Aristotle, Culverwel was aware of the danger to learning which lay in the uncritical study of that great author.

" When any author is quoted and commended, all the credit and esteem that is to be given him, is founded either in the reason which he doth annex to his assertions, or else in this more remote and general reason, that such a one had a very clear and bright lamp, that the candle of the Lord did shine very eminently in him. Far be it from me to drop one word that should tend to the staining and eclipsing of that just glory that is due to the immortal name of Aristotle. Yet this I shall say, that to set him up as a pope in philosophy, as a visible head of the truth militant, to condemn all for heretics that oppose him, for schismatics that depart from him, for apostates that deny him; what's all this but to forget that he was but the candle of the Lord, and to adore him as the sun in the firmament that was set to rule the day of knowledge " (p. 128).

In matters of religion, reason is to be preferred to all forms of tradition save scripture.

" These writings the providence of God hath deeply engaged itself to keep as the apples of his own eye. And they do not borrow their certainty or validity from any ecclesiastical or universal tradition, but from those prints of divinity in them, and specially from the seal of the same Spirit that endited them, and now assures the soul, that they were oracles breathed from God Himself. As for all other

sacred antiquity, though I shall ever honour it as much as any either did or can do justly, and with sobriety; and shall always reverence a gray-headed truth; yet if antiquity should stand in competition with the lamp of the Lord (though genuine antiquity would never do it), yet if it should, it must not think much if we prefer reason, a daughter of eternity, before antiquity which is the offspring of time" (pp. 130-1).

Calvinist theologians often found reason troublesome in matters of faith; and they were therefore tempted to speak of it as slightingly as the modern rulers of Germany speak of her "intellectuals." Our author was anxious to show them that reason could live peaceably alongside faith. He was at one with his critics in regarding reason and faith as different activities of the mind. Reason was common to all men, though in all it was more or less ruined by sin; faith was God's gift to the few.

"God manifests these mysterious secrets only to a few friends, His Spirit whispers to a few, shines upon a few" (p. 144).

Culverwel was too well aware of the weakness of reason to think that it could ever take the place of faith.

"Do but imagine such a thing as this, that this world should be adjudged never to see the sun more, never to see one star more. If God should shut all the windows of heaven, and allow it nothing but the light of a candle, how would this world look? 'Tis now but an obscure prison with a few grates to look out at, but what would it be then but a capacious grave, but a nethermost dungeon? Yet this were a more grateful shade, a pleasanter and more comely darkness, than for a soul to be condemned to the solitary light of its own lamp, so as not to have any supernatural irradiations from its God" (p. 136).

When reason and faith were truly understood, there was no strife between them; God never intended the soul to be torn between the two.

"The light of reason doth no more prejudice the light of faith, than the light of a candle doth extinguish the light of a star. The same eye of the soul may look sometimes upon a lamp, and sometimes upon a star; one while upon a first principle, another while upon a revealed truth, as hereafter it shall always look upon the sun, and see God face to face. The most that reason can do, is to fill the understanding to the brim, but faith, that throws the soul into the ocean, and

lets it roll and bathe itself in the vastness and fulness of a Deity. There are some understandings that neither spin nor toil, and yet Solomon in all his wisdom and glory was not clothed like one of these" (pp. 137, 146).

In the next chapter we may see the glory which falls upon a common theme when it is handled by a great artist. Many have urged that the pleasures of the mind are greater and more durable than those of sense, but few were as well endowed as our author for this work. He opens with an astonishing page in praise of light.

"All light is pleasant, 'tis the very smile of nature, the gloss of the world, the varnish of creation, a bright paraphrase upon bodies. Whether it discover itself in the modesty of a morning blush, and open its fair and virgin eyelids in the dawning of the day; or whether it dart out more vigorous and sprightful beams, shining out in its noon-day glory; whether it sport and twinkle in a star; or blaze and glare out in a comet; or frisk and dance in a jewel; or dissemble and play the hypocrite in a glow-worm; or epitomize and abbreviate itself in a spark; or show its zeal and the ruddiness of its complexion, in the yolk of the fire; or grow more pale, pining, and consuming away, in a candle; however 'tis pleased to manifest itself, it carries a commanding lustre in its face; though sometimes indeed it be veiled and shadowed; sometimes 'tis clouded and imprisoned; sometimes 'tis soiled and discoloured. Who will not salute so lovely a beauty with a χαῖρε φώς, welcome thou first-born of corporeal beings; thou lady and queen of sensitive beauties; thou clarifier and refiner of the chaos, thou unspotted beauty of the universe" (p. 148).

But the light which falls on earth cannot rival in beauty the light of the mind, and in a world where all things delight in pleasure, one of the deepest pleasures of man is the light of reason.

"Have you not seen a bee make a trade of pleasure, and like a little epicure faring deliciously every day, whilst it lies at the breast of a flower, drawing and sucking out the purest sweetness? An intellectual bee that deflowers most elegant authors, a learned epicure that sups up more orient pearls than ever Cleopatra did, one that delights in the embraces of truth and goodness, hath he not a more refined and clarified pleasure, than a wanton Corinthian that courts Lais, than a soft Sardanapalus spinning among his courtesans?" (pp. 149-50).

Epicurus talked much about pleasure, but he did not rightly understand it.

" His dwelling was in a garden, a fit place to crown with rose-buds, to let no flower of spring pass untouched by him. His death was very conformable to his life, for he expired with a cup of wine at his mouth " (p. 152).

Yet even Epicurus sometimes admitted that " the supreme delight is stored and treasured up in intellectuals." Sensual pleasure is limited to the present, and vanishes when the " north wind blows upon thy garden, and when the frost nips thy tender grapes." But the pleasures of the mind are not thus limited.

" The mind does not only drink pleasure out of present fountains, but it can taste those streams of delight that are run away long ago " (p. 153).

Even the pleasures of the mind will not bring complete happiness, for reason itself desires something beyond them. This theme, which has been heard as an undertone throughout the Discourse, now appears in all its beauty. Reason deepens our longing for that vision of God in which alone its powers will be used rightly and to the full. Culverwel has already told us that God gave us reason so that He might communicate Himself to us; that the weakness of reason leads us to desire Him; and that God has given us some certainty, so that we may have a " satisfactory enjoyment of Him." Thus by many ways he has led us to the end of his thinking, the vision of God. Reason cannot be satisfied until it returns to its own source, and is lost in the eternal contemplation of Him from whom it took its origin.

" Reason 'tis soon weary with its fluttering up and down among the creatures, the candle of the Lord does but waste itself in vain searching for happiness here below. Some of the choicest heathens did thus spend their lamps and exhaust their oil, and then at length were fain to lie down in darkness and sorrow; their lamps did show them some glimmering appearance of a Summum Bonum at a great distance, but did not sufficiently direct them in the way to it, no more than a candle can guide a traveller that is ignorant of his way. God has ordained man to a choicer end, than these natural faculties can either deserve or maintain or enjoy. Nature's hand cannot earn it, Nature's hand cannot reach it, Nature's eye cannot see it. That glorious and ultimate end which must fill and satiate the being of man, is the beatifical vision of God Himself. This candle of the Lord may shine

here below, it may and doth aspire and long for happiness; but yet it will not come near it, till He that lighted it up, be pleased to lift it up to Himself, and there transform it into a star, that may drink in everlasting light and influence from its original and fountain of light" (pp. 163, 168, 175).

A. C. SCUPHOLME.

A Sacred Poem

THE only reason for reading a difficult poem is some assurance that it contains goodness great enough to outweigh the evil of its difficulty. For Mr Williams' *Taliessin*[1] I have such assurance, partly from his previous works, and partly from what the poem itself discloses even at a first reading. It makes me see things: snow that "falls over brick and prickle," a star "that rode by through the round window in the sky of Camelot," a bucket from a well that as "a round plane of water rose shining in the sun"; or even "the source of all stone, The rigid tornado, the schism and first strife of primeval rock with itself." It also delights my ear. The result of its clashing accents is as if we were being continually thrown up or kept off the ground; no verse is, in the Greek sense of the word, more meteorous. I tremble to call Mr Williams Pindaric lest I should rouse associations with Cowley and Dryden. But Pindar is the poet I think of in reading *Taliessin*, with its combination of jagged weight and soaring movement, its ability to narrate while remaining lyric, and (above all) its prevailing quality of glory—its blaze.

Of the difficulties some are legitimate, some not. When Mr Williams uses "who fly the porphyry stair" to mean those who fly up, or ascend, not those who shun or avoid, the stair, he is disobeying the language. In the "background" which his poem assumes he is sometimes guilty of a little "privatism"; but in the main he demands of us familiarity with books which we certainly ought to know—the Bible, Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*, the *Decline and Fall*. It is also desirable to have read his own essay *He Came Down from Heaven*: indeed, three doctrines from that book are so

[1] *Taliessin through Logres*, by Charles Williams. Oxford University Press, 6s.

worked into the texture of the poem that they had better be restated here.

I. The Fall. Genesis means what it says. Man, knowing nothing but good, aspired to know good and evil. This was indeed to know " as gods," for God knows not only the good He has made but all unrealized possibilities, including those that are evil. Hence in the poem—

> I remembered how the Archbishop in Caerleon at a feast
> preached that before the making of man or beast
> the Emperor knew all carved contingent shapes.

This knowledge man desired, asking himself in Paradise—

> Am I not too long meanly retired
> in the poor space of joy's single dimension ?
> Does not God vision the principles at war ?
> Let us grow to the height of God and the Emperor:
> Let us gaze, son of man, on the Acts in contention.

But man's knowledge is by experience, not by " pure intelligence." To know evil means, for him, to experience it. And since all being is good, this means to experience good as evil. Thus for fallen man his heaven-built body becomes an obscenity, and virtue a law fruitful of death, and God Himself " the headless Emperor," the anti-God. " The feet of creation walk backward."

II. " The Theology of Romantic Love." Mr Williams combines two positions not often held together. On the one hand, he is with Blake and Lawrence in glorification of the body. Caucasia, which represents its least honourable area, is thus celebrated:

> The Emperor's sun shone on each róund móund,
> double fortalices defending dales of fertility.
> The bright blades shone in the craft of the dancing war;
> the stripped maids laughed for joy of the province
> founded in the base of space,
> in the rounded bottom of the Emperor's glory.

On the other hand, Mr Williams reaffirms the amatory doctrine of the *Vita Nuova* with complete conviction.

III. " Substitution " or " exchange." Anselm was right in holding a substitutional, but not in holding a " forensic," doctrine of the Atonement. Vicariousness depends on no " transaction " or " legal fiction," being the most familiar thing in the world, a fact of daily experience. The taunt

"He saved others; himself he cannot save" is a *definition* of the Kingdom. What some thought most fantastic in the author's greatest romance (*Descent into Hell*) is serious.

> The everlasting house that the soul discovers
> is always another's: we must lose our ówn énds;
> we must always live in the habitation of our lovers,
> my friend's shelter for me, mine for him.

The type of substitution in the poem is Percivale's sister, who in Malory (XVII, xi) "bled a dish full of blood to heal a lady, wherefore she died." The parody of Substitution is money, the liberated symbol which becomes perilously autonomous: "small crowns, small dragons," "the long file of whose snouts crosses the empire."

The greatest, but also the most legitimate, of *Taliessin's* difficulties lies in its symbolism. I define the difference between Allegory and Symbolism thus: in Allegory the images stand for concepts (giant Despair, Mr Legality), in Symbolism for something the poet has experienced but which he has not reduced, perhaps cannot reduce, to a concept. Allegory can always be translated back into the concepts: the "meaning" of a symbolical work cannot be stated in conceptual language because it is too concrete. The thing meant by the poet has probably met him in a variety of situations, and therefore, if we try to treat his work as allegory, we always find that each image has too many "meanings." The procedure is not, however, useless, provided that we do not take it for more than a scaffolding to our real reading of the poem. Let us apply it to Mr Williams' central symbol, Byzantium. Treated *as though it were allegory*, Byzantium may be said to have the following "meanings":

(1) The actual Byzantine Empire ruling its "themes" or provinces by the Acts, the Pandects, and the Code, which issue from the presence chamber at the top of the porphyry stair where "the lions roar that stand in the Byzantine glory." These Acts, written in "Greek minuscula," are translated into "all the dialects." Logothetes run down the stairs, chariots go "clattering" out of Byzantium to bear missives to the whole empire. Outside the empire we have Broceliande in the west, Islam in the south, to the north mere "mammoth and bear." Eastward the world

fades away into the utterly unknown, the inverted, the antipodes—P'O-Lu. It is supposed, unhistorically, that Britain was part of the Byzantine Empire.

(2) Man. But the diagram on the endleaf must not be taken too seriously. It works well for " the breasts of *intelligo* and *credo* " in the University of Paris, and for the " Italian ' hands ' "—the operative and manipulative organs used in bridge-building, agriculture, and the celebration of the Eucharist (" the heart-breaking manual acts of the Pope "). Jerusalem is in the genitals because the author follows the tradition that Jerusalem is on the site of Paradise, a place of generation and regeneration. But the position of Byzantium itself at the navel, though appropriate enough, is not to be stressed. Byzantium, when distinguished from the whole empire, is the total Man or Person as opposed to his members. Thus energy arising from the loins but humanized in the *ἡγεμονικόν* is " stuff of Caucasia fashioned in Byzantium." In fact, Byzantium might as well be the head as the navel: and the location of Logres at the head is best disregarded. Logres is mainly the here and now, middle-earth, the scene of the poem's action. It must be remembered that the endleaf is a fanciful comment on the poem, not a " key."

(3) Order, discipline, civilization. When we meet a slave in the stocks and another whose back is scarred by " the hazel's stripes," Mr Williams is not showing us the " reverse side " of Camelot's glory. For those slaves the stocks and the rod are a good—the appearance of law proper to their stage of development. When Taliessin awaits the moment to charge at Mount Badon, he sees Virgil " civilized centuries away " seeking " for the invention of the City by the phrase." Identifying that imposition of form upon matter with his own imposition of the King's will upon the barbarians, " he fetched the pen of his spear from its bearer," and as he advanced, " the Æneid's beaked lines swooped on Actium." (A German professor said to me a year ago, " The last war was a war between Homer and Virgil—and Virgil was on your side.")

(4) The Divine Order, " the army of unalterable law." Hence—

> In a train of golden cars
> the Emperor went above,
> for over me in my riding
> shot seven golden stars.

The Emperor is God. The Logothetes translating the Acts (" phenomenally abating " them " to kinds and kindreds ") represent what Plato has told us in *Republic* 476 (ἓν ἕκαστον εἶναι, τῇ δε τῶν πράξεων κ.τ.λ. κοινωνίᾳ . . . πολλὰ φαίνεσθαι). The Presence Chamber, approached by the porphyry stair, is the all-explanatory Beatific Vision,

> a tangle of compensations,
> every joint a centre,
> and every centre a jewel.
> Each moment there is the midmost.

Treated as an allegory, Byzantium is all these things and more. If anyone asks, " Why does he not say what he means ?" or " How am I to know which he means in each place ?" we must reply that the poet has not started with concepts like " Man " or " Order." He started with a something in his experience, characterized by glory, but also by a strict or mathematic quality—something that meets him in the life of a great jurist (see *Many Dimensions*), in the gesture of a policeman on point duty (see *The Greater Trumps*), in the orderly conduct of a publishing house (see the Dedication to *Taliessin*), and also in the human body, and in all that he knows and believes of the Divine Order. Byzantium is not a communal fancy-dress for half a dozen concepts: it is an imaginative net to catch that single, utterly concrete constituent of experience which has no name and which we come to know by using the symbol Byzantium. In so far as the poem succeeds we shall find ourselves recognizing " Byzantium," henceforward in all sorts of hitherto unrelated experiences of our own.

The choice of Byzantium depends principally on the fact that we think of the Byzantine Empire as something splendid and exotic, but also stiff, formalized, hierarchical; and this union of qualities does justice to the union of glory and severity in Mr Williams' vision. This is essential. His celebration of the human body, for example, has nothing to do with the gulfs of unmediated feeling. He teaches a " doctrine of Euclidean love ": anatomists and drawing-masters are better teachers of the body's importance than psycho-analysts. It is " the *accurate* flash " of Iseult's eyes and the perception that, in her, " curves of golden life define The straightness of a perfect line " by which Palomides is ravished. The hazel wands which make good rods for barbarian backs are also measuring-rods. With them

the long roads of the empire are measured out so that in wooded Logres " the nuts of the uncut hazel fall Down the cut hazel's way." Virgil is painted on the wall of the presence chamber handing down to Taliessin " a shoot of hazel—the hexameter, the decasyllabic line." At the crowning of Arthur this πέρας or *mesura* is seen riding in peaceful triumph on its opposite;

> The beasts of Broceliande, the fish of Nimue,
> hierarchic, republican, the glory of Logres,
> patterns of the Logos in the depth of the sun.
> Taliessin in the crowd beheld the compélled brútes,
> wildness formalized, images of mathematics.

With this passage I have raised the question of what lies beyond Byzantium, and this reminds me that other symbols have to be considered. Mr Williams' map marks the road to P'O-Lu in the east, but not the road to Broceliande, which, as we learn from the text, lies west of Britain. P'O-Lu we know—the antipodes where the " headless Emperor moves on an inarticulate sea " where " the Roman hands," " the substantial instruments of being," are lost. Broceliande is more difficult. It is divided from P'O-Lu by the width of the whole map, but in a round world East and West meet. Out of it comes Merlin and into it he returns. Nimue lives there. Crude beings, unformed energies, " unthumbed shapes of apes," grow there and steam out of it. It is not evil;

> there no strife
> is except growth from the roots, nor reaction but repose;
> vigours of joy drive up: rich-ringed moments
> thick in their trunks thrive, young-leaved their voices.

Broceliande is rather like " the mothers " in *Faust*, the cave of Demogorgon in Shelley, the " abyss " in Böhme's theosophy. The theologian, tolerating no ultimate dualism, must determine, if he can, the relation of Broceliande to the Emperor; but for the imagination it must generally, I expect, where it is not ignored, be felt as something outside the empire, or meeting the empire only at some *coincidentia oppositorum* which is off the map. At all events the world of the poem would be incomplete without it.

Merlin comes nearest of all Mr Williams' figures to allegory. He is called " time's metre," and even " time." Yet he is more than a mere " Father Time " with an hour glass. He assists at the birth of Galahad (a type of Christ), and

" the force of the worlds " is in him. He is operative history, the mover, that which brings things to pass. He is the relentless obstacle to the fulfilment of Arthur's fantasies. Conjuring " at the height of the thin night air of Quinquagesima " when Galahad was born, he sees, in vision, the King " dreaming of a red grail in an ivory Logres ": but—

> magic
> throws no truck with dreams; the rod thrust by.

It will be seen that Arthur is by no means the hero of the poem. Mr Williams' argument is the Fall and the Redemption in Logres. Logres falls partly through the evil and contradiction inherent in every human order as such, partly through the actual sins of its leaders. The first is made clearest in the section entitled " The King's Coins "—" What can be saved without order ? and how order ? . . . What without coinage or with coinage can be saved ?" For the second the author follows those episodes in Malory which are more significant than Malory saw. He connects the two tragedies of ignorance, Balin's fratricide and Arthur's incest, in a passage of extraordinary power. He makes good use of a heavenly irony in the old story (I think Professor Vinaver first did justice to it) whereby Lancelot, having sinned through love, offends against the code of love to his own shame but by that offence begets Galahad the redeemer. The birth of Galahad is the crisis of the poem. At the moment of his birth the tide turned:

> The Emperor in Byzantium nodded to the exarchs;
> it was night still when the army began to move,
> embarking, disembarking, before dawn Asia
> awoke to hear the songs, the shouts, the wheels.

There is only one section in this poem which, in my opinion, sinks below the general level, and that is " The Coming of Galahad" (not to be confused with the magnificent birth-story, " The Son of Lancelot"), in which the obscurities are to me impenetrable and the style is dangerously near a mannerism. For the rest, the poem has greatness enough to justify the intensive study it exacts. It shows its greatness, in Pascal's words, not by being " at an extremity," but by being simultaneously " at two extremities and filling all the space between." The material may be called, in more senses than one, " romantic "; the technique is modern both

for good and evil—for evil in the obscurities it tolerates, for good in the fresh, harsh energy of its unstaled diction and the headlight sharpness of its vision. Mr Williams does not need by any deprecatory gestures to dissociate his Arthurianism from that of Morris and Tennyson. Some readers who think of the story solely in " Victorian " terms may prove incurable: but in reality there is a passion in Mr Williams' very rhythms that forbids him to sink to mere " charm." But we must also avoid a misunderstanding in the opposite direction, a " modernist " misunderstanding. Mr Williams can be harsh, he can talk of " jakes and latrines," and of other things which would once have been thought prosaic. But the precise differentia of his genius lies in offering us something much less usual. He has got all necessary " disillusionment " over before the poem begins, so that no more need be said on that well-worn theme, and we can proceed at once to something positive. We find throughout an understanding of health, of discipline, and (above all) of courtesy, which are rare at the present time. No poem expresses more charity or less indulgence. But perhaps its greatest gift to us is what I have called the quality of Glory. The thing is new, but can only be indicated by reference to those old things which are least unlike it. I have already mentioned Pindar, and I am prepared to maintain, without for one moment forgetting Wordsworth and Gray, that the third piece in *Taliessin* (the " Vision of the Empire ") is the first real example in English of " the greater ode." If this comparison proves unhelpful to some readers, I would refer them to the Archangels' song from the Prologue in Heaven to *Faust* and tell them that in Mr Williams they will find something of its golden, noonday vitality. But what finally convinced me that he has written a great poem was a transformation which my judgment underwent in reading it. I liked its " flavour " from the first, but found it so idiosyncratic that I thought the book might be what Lamb called a " favourite," a thing not for all days or all palates, like *Tristram Shandy* or the *Arcadia*. But as I went on I found bit after bit of my " real world " falling into its place within the poem. I found pair after pair of opposites harmoniously reconciled. I began to see that what had seemed a deliciously private universe was the common universe after all: that this apparently romantic and even wilful poem was really " classic " and central. I do not think this can happen in a minor work. And I think, to compare great things with

small, that in this respect the poem bears a significant resemblance to the Faith it celebrates. The entrance is not very big, not very obvious, not recognizably made for all kinds of men; but, once inside, there is room for everybody, food for most diverse stomachs, medicine for many different diseases.

C. S. Lewis.

The Beginnings of "Hymns Ancient and Modern"[1]

The most famous and widely used of all English hymn-books would seem to have had its origin in a railway carriage. In the summer of 1858 two clergymen, the Rev. William Denton and the Rev. F. H. Murray, were travelling together on the Great Western and fell to talking about hymn-books. For staunch high churchmen such as they were this was a comparatively new subject of interest. The original Tractarians were at first distrustful of hymn-singing, which they regarded as an eccentricity of "Dissenters" and their Evangelical imitators. But as the Oxford Movement spread and became more popular in character, the value of hymns was more and more recognized as a means both of giving brightness and variety to the services and also of driving home "Catholic" doctrine. Nor, after all, was there anything new-fangled or unorthodox about such things: if "Dissenters" sang hymns, so did the Church centuries before "Dissenters" were heard of. Thus in the space of a few years a crowd of hymnals had come into existence to meet the new needs of those who could not be satisfied with the various Evangelical collections of "Psalms and Hymns."

In this making of hymn-books both our clergymen had played a leading part. Mr Denton, vicar of St Bartholomew's, Cripplegate, was the editor (originally in conjunction with the Rev. W. Cooke) of the *Church Hymnal*—a collection first published in 1853, for which he claimed that it had "a larger sale than all other Church hymnals put together and was taken in every diocese in England." Mr Murray, who was rector of Chislehurst for half a century, had produced

[1] This sketch is compiled from papers in the possession of the Proprietors of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*. It is a new chapter in the history of hymnology, since the papers were apparently not known to Bishop Frere when he composed the Historical Edition of that book.

in 1852, with the help of a former curate, the Rev. C. R. Harrison, a small collection called *A Hymnal for Use in the English Church*, which had reached a third edition. Of the two books Denton's was at this time the more important; and it was presumably in order to lessen competition that he now suggested to Murray an amalgamation of their respective books, with the addition of a third, edited by another former curate of Murray's, the Rev. G. Cosby White, who had recently become curate-in-charge of St Barnabas', Pimlico. Mr White had been appointed Provost of the Collegiate Church of Cumbrae in the western isles of Scotland in 1851, and a year later had issued for use there a collection of *Hymns and Introits*, which had also been adopted by the Rev. W. Upton Richards, at All Saints', Margaret Street. For himself, Murray welcomed Denton's proposal —indeed, at the time when he was engaged in preparing his own book he had made unsuccessful overtures to Denton and Cooke with a similar object. As to the chance of White's coming into the scheme he was less confident; for he understood that (like the revered Dr Neale) White was "rather dogged against modern hymns."

However, Murray promised to see what could be done when White came back from his holiday. Meanwhile, he took counsel with Sir Henry W. Baker, vicar of Monkland, Herefordshire, who had for some time been engaged on a similar scheme for eliminating competition by pooling the resources of the rival high church hymn-books in a single book. To him, in a letter of July 23, Murray set forth the difficulties and the advantages of Denton's suggestion. "If the plan of Denton's or the one to which you before urged me was carried out, Denton, White and we must still at the same time each keep on a *continued* edition of each book for the sake of those who now use it." On the other hand, "our three books are in so many respects so similar that they ought not to go along three parallel roads." He added, "With regard to your own movement, you are, I suppose, too advanced for me *now* to say, Will you pause till you hear the result of what I have said above?"

Baker's reply has not survived: but he apparently mentioned the name of the Rev. Percival Ward as one likely to be interested in an "idea of a union of hymnals." Murray therefore wrote to Ward on August 10, telling him that Baker had spoken of him and sounding him as to the possibility of his collaborating. "For myself I should be most

glad if anything can be done to obviate the great evil of the multiplication of Hymnals formed on a Catholic basis, and yet differing without any reasonable difference. The Salisbury book" [edited by Earl Nelson and issued in 1857] " ought to be united also—only they have taken such licence in altering well-known hymns. I hope we might all agree to some common terms and make one book for the future."

Both White and Ward having come into line, the next step was to get together the parties concerned for a consultation; and a meeting was arranged for September. Denton, of course, was invited, but now began to draw back. The scheme was not turning out to be quite what he had intended. His own book was not to swallow up the others, but was to be only one ingredient in a new book in which the identity of all alike would be lost. On September 6 he wrote to Mr Upton Richards. While agreeing that " it is a great waste of strength and injurious to us all to multiply books," he asked, " Can anything be done to make the *Church Hymnal* usable for a larger number? Would it not be better to make, so far as we can, this one perfect by an appendix rather than start a new one?" Richards sent this letter to Murray, who in turn sent it to Baker with the words written on the back, " I have written to Denton to say that I do not agree with him and hope he will meet us."

The hope was not fulfilled: Denton did not turn up at the meeting. Over three years later (February 5, 1862) he wrote to Murray complaining that the latter had expressed surprise that he should have " backed out of association in bringing out " *Hymns Ancient and Modern*. " I did not back out," he protested. " I was never asked to join in it. . . . A friend suggested that I should be asked and received a short answer that *they did not intend doing so*. I regretted it at the time and I do still regret it." In his reply Murray admitted that he had spoken of " backing out," but " without any particle of unfriendly feeling." " My recollection of facts," he went on, " is rather at variance with your own." Then follows the fullest account we have of the earliest stages of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*:

> You will remember our conversation in the train on the Great Western—the proposal that present Editors should unite in abandoning, as far as they could, interest in their books, and unite in an endeavour to promote *one* good one. We parted with an assent to this idea. Sir H. Baker had for some time pressed on me the thorough revision of my own book, but I

had shrunk from the labour. When an opening was made for *joint* labour and the co-operation of many skilled hands, I gladly took up the project and wrote to Sir H. B. What steps *immediately* succeeded I cannot recall, but a committee was called together, or perhaps *then* it might be called rather a consultation. Whether you were asked or not I cannot now say —but I know well that we were surprised you did not come. I myself undertook to *go to you in the City* [Denton lived in Finsbury Circus] *early the following morning to try and get you to our next meeting.* I went, and to my astonishment and regret found you were not prepared to join us, but intended to adhere to your own book, upon the extended use of which I remember your expatiating—and my conclusion was, that unless we would accept your book, amend *that* and make that not only *the basis* of a new book but make *it the book* because of the ground it already preoccupied, you were not prepared to meet us. I came away sorely disappointed, because as you and I *originated* the matter, I and the others had much desired and had counted upon your co-operation. . . . That *afterwards* you should not have been asked I can quite understand, because it was simply thought to be of *no use* to do so.

The meeting at which Denton failed to appear was held at White's house at St Barnabas', Pimlico, and was attended by Murray, Baker, Harrison and White, together with a friend and neighbour of Baker's, the Rev. W. Pulling, vicar of Eastnor. It was formally resolved to proceed with the scheme for a hymnal on the lines proposed, and a committee was constituted. Sir Henry Baker was appointed secretary; and henceforth it was he, and not Murray, who was to take the lead till his death in 1877, and, by his union of competence, enthusiasm and an almost pugnacious concentration on the interests of the undertaking, to become the real maker of *Hymns Ancient and Modern.* To the committee thus constituted three other names were added—Mr Upton Richards, the Rev. G. H. Huntingford and the future Bishop of Ely, J. R. Woodford, author of the well-known translation of *Adoro te devote* and at this time vicar of Kempsford. Further additions were made later. Woodford had already written on September 6, forwarding a copy of a hymnal which he, the Rev. W. H. Beadon and the Rev. G. Phillimore had compiled for use in some parishes in the diocese of Gloucester and Bristol, with the comment: " I should like to know whether you think our principles of compilation likely to be so far identical as to enable us to unite in preparing a new book."

Before proceeding further, the committee desired to win a still wider basis of advice and support for their plan. With this object the following advertisement was inserted in *The Guardian* of October 20, 1858.

To the Clergy, and others interested in Hymnology.

The Editors of several existing Hymnals, being engaged, with others, in the compilation of a Book which they hope may secure a more general acceptance from Churchmen, would be very thankful for any suggestions from persons interested in the matter.

This advertisement speedily brought in a host of letters —a number of them being from compilers of actual or prospective hymnals. Even apart from the interest and desire to help which they expressed, these letters were valuable as showing the urgent need of the committee's attempt to bring some degree of uniformity and responsibility into what had become a chaotic wilderness of individual and not always competent enterprise. Among those who sent already existing collections that they had helped to make were the future Bishop Walsham How and Edward Twells, brother of the well-known hymn-writer, Henry Twells. A Yorkshire clergyman, the Rev. W. Braithwaite, wrote that he and a group of friends had been engaged in making a hymn-book and suggested a contact which later became a definite collaboration. The Rev. J. Hamilton found the committee's motives and principles " so much in accordance with those which I have endeavoured to act upon in forming the collection I have now in hand that I am quite disposed to postpone its publication until I have seen that which you are preparing, and should be most happy to co-operate." A clergyman of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Rev. G. F. Boyle, sent proof-sheets of a hymnal in preparation for use in that body under the auspices of the bishops, with notes and suggestions; and others sent selections of their own and offers of help. The letters expressed widely different views as to the kind of material that should be included. Some desired little else than translations from the Latin; others deprecated these as rarely successful and unlikely to be popular with congregations. Braithwaite even saw in the committee's predilection for such things a serious bar to combination with them, adding the startling opinion: " I am afraid *Adeste fideles* is not good anywhere "! One correspondent wrote: " I do not know the All Saints,

Margaret Street hymnal, but I do feel strongly that anything bearing the stamp of the Margaret Street services is not likely to meet with the approbation of the London clergy." In the opposite camp, presumably, was the stalwart who would have nothing but "the productions of Churchmen." "The Church has no right to and has no need of Sectarian hymns."

Meanwhile, the committee was hard at work collecting and weighing material. John Keble, though declining to join it, had given the wise counsel: "If you desire to make a Hymn Book for the use of the Church, make it comprehensive"; and undoubtedly the following of this advice had much to do with the success of the book. On the other hand it was not forgotten that it was also to be "Catholic" in the narrower sense of the word; and a special prominence was given to translations of the ancient Latin hymns, especially in the sections for the ecclesiastical seasons. Here the lack of translations was a difficulty—especially of those in the iambic dimeter of the Latin office hymns. But the committee set valiantly to work themselves to add to those which Neale had already produced for the *Hymnal Noted.* Even these latter were somewhat ruthlessly handled by way of "improving" them. Unlike most hymn-writers, Neale himself was very good-natured about this. Acknowledging a copy of the preliminary book of 1859 he wrote: "I have been asked more than once whether I had any objection to my own hymns being altered, as might suit the Committee's taste. And I have always answered 'Not the least.' I do not imagine, indeed, I hardly wish, that we should see an authorized Hymnal in our own day: and therefore the more people try their hand at improving, the more those who are concerned in its final compilation will have to choose from." At the same time, while admitting that in some cases the changes were improvements, he thought that in others they were for the worse.

A letter of Baker's (December 15, 1858) throws some interesting light on the methods of the committee:

> The result of correspondence and thought hitherto has led me to 2 or 3 conclusions which I think it would be well if the Committee would think over before our next meeting: 1st, I propose that *all* hymns which we take from the *Sarum* Breviary (and perhaps Roman also) be translated in the metres of the original; and if they are given in the *Hymnal Noted* that they be made to suit the tunes there; but that with regard to hymns

from other ancient sources, the Paris e.g., we be at liberty to do as we like. This is a modification of my original idea, which was to adhere invariably to the old metres; and I make it because *practically* it would not do to have scarcely anything except Long Measures in hymns for the Seasons, for those who do *not* use the old tunes . . . ; 2nd, that it would be well in the course of 3 or 4 months—say about Easter—to print some proofs (roughly) of hymns that we have agreed to—those proofs being of different parts of the book . . . and send to all who have answered the advertisement or whom we know of as wanting a Hymnal . . . ; 3rd, to *profess* to give among the general hymns some that would be suitable for singing in mission rooms, at lectures in cottages, etc., rather than in church. We want such—and this would give *good grounds* on which to admit some as to which we should otherwise feel bound to be more strict. It would be a popular characteristic of the book too.

The councils of the committee were not always completely harmonious. Woodford criticized the proposed translations as " mostly laboured renderings, without flow "; and later left the committee to prepare a new edition of his own book. In connexion with this he had some trouble with his former colleagues, who resented what they regarded as an unexplained secession. More restive still was the Rev. F. Pott, author of several hymns now familiar and an associate of the Mr Hamilton already mentioned as prepared to sacrifice his own projected hymnal in order to co-operate in the new one. Hamilton took no share in this himself (he died of overwork in the spring of 1859); but Pott apparently represented him. He was specially concerned about the doctrinal aspect of some of the Latin hymns to be included—notably *Sponsa Christi* and *Pange lingua*, which he regarded as " defining what the Church of England has purposely left undefined." He threatened to leave the committee unless these were removed; and, when it was pointed out that they were already in White's and Murray's collections, replied that he had joined in ignorance of the fact that what was proposed was an amalgamation of existing hymnals. He finally resigned on February 21, 1860, on the ground that he was " a hindrance rather than a help "; and immediately set to work again on his dead friend Hamilton's hymnal. Disapproving of copyright in hymns, he acted on the principle by helping himself to the committee's material. His " plagiarisms " brought on him a furious onslaught from the fiery Baker when his book appeared in

November, 1862; and in the end he was compelled to promise that it should rank as a purely private venture for the use of himself and a few friends. Here and elsewhere, to the end of his life, Baker showed himself inexorable both in tracking down and in avenging infringements of the copyrights of his beloved book—copyrights which were regarded as including not only its own new hymns but its versions of old ones as well.

By the end of May, 1859, Baker was in a position to carry out his plan of the previous December and circulate a "specimen" book. This was a little pamphlet of 36 pages containing 50 hymns (34 printed in full, the rest indicated by their first lines). The hymns were for Advent, Christmas and Epiphany, with a group of General hymns (15) at the end. A preliminary notice stated that "The following hymns are printed as a specimen of the New Hymn Book now in preparation by a committee of about twenty Clergymen, including the Editors of several existing Hymn Books." Further particulars were added, with a request for criticisms and suggestions and the additional announcement: "An accompanying Book of Tunes is also in preparation, under the superintendence of an eminent and well-known Church Musician" [*i.e.*, Dr W. H. Monk]. It was hoped that the book would be ready by Advent.

This hope was not to be fulfilled. But on November 18 a considerably larger collection than that issued in May was put forth, in paper covers and priced at 6d. This contained 108 pages and 138 hymns, and bore on the back of its cover the announcement: "These hymns are printed for temporary use, and as a specimen, still open to revision, of the Hymn Book now in course of preparation by a Committee of Clergymen, the publication of which has now been postponed to Advent 1860. . . . The book will probably contain about 300 hymns. . . . A Sixpenny edition will be published in good type. Any suggestions will be gladly received."

Nearly a year later a circular (dated October 30, 1860) was issued over Baker's name, announcing that the "Hymn Book that we have been so long preparing" would be ready by Advent Sunday. "It contains 270 pages and will be sold . . . in cloth covers on the thinner paper 6d. and in limp roan on the better paper 1s." This original edition contained 273 hymns, which were to be increased to 386 by the addition of the appendix of 1868. The publication

of an edition "with Accompanying Tunes" followed quickly, being announced for March 20, 1861. So began the astonishing career of a book which has been described with hardly an exaggeration as "the most successful publishing venture of the nineteenth century."

C. S. Phillips.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Quick has been Professor of Divinity and Ecclesiastical History in the University of Durham and Canon of Durham Cathedral since 1934. A review of his book, *Doctrines of the Creed*, will be found on p. 299.

Mr Mackinnon is a Fellow of Keble College, Oxford.

The Rev. A. C. Scupholme is assistant curate of Helmsley, York. His article is a sequel to that which we published last month.

Mr Lewis is a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. He has recently published a first novel, which is reviewed on p. 303.

Dr Phillips has been Chaplain of the College of St Nicholas, Chislehurst, since 1931. His published works include *Hymnody Past and Present* (1937).

Dr Sykes is Professor of History in the University of London and Canon Theologian of Liverpool Cathedral.

The Rev. H. Chalmer Bell, rector of North Crawley, is at present on a visit to Rumania of several months' duration.

COMMENT ON PERIODICALS

(*a*) Theological

The discovery of the Lachish Letters is the most valuable find yet made in the Biblical archæology of Palestine, and students of the Old Testament will be grateful to Professor Winton Thomas for his excellent survey in the January number of *The Journal of Theological Studies*[1] of the different theories which have been put forward for the interpretation of these letters. He emphasizes the necessity of establishing the true reading of the texts before embarking upon their interpretation, and contributes to this end some careful observations on the proper names in the Letters. The same issue contains the first part of a discussion of the arguments for the existence of God by Dr Broad. Following in the train of Hume and Kant, Dr Broad notes the failure of exponents of the ontological argument to distinguish between the logical structures of existential and characterizing propositions, and suggests further that the cosmological argument has seemed valid to many in the past

[1] Oxford University Press. 5s. quarterly.

largely because of their assumption that mathematics is the paradigm of knowledge. *The Expository Times*[1] for February continues the series " After Fifty Years " with an article on " Higher Criticism and the Prophetic Literature," by Professor T. H. Robinson, in which he sets out with the clarity born of deep reading and wide knowledge the movement in recent years away from preoccupation with style and doctrine, as means of sifting out the " original " prophet from the late gloss, towards the idea of collections of sayings which were afterwards written down and later still combined to form our prophetic books. The same issue contains a short essay entitled " Modern not Modernist," by Dr Garvie, who has also written for *The Congregational Quarterly*[2] for January an article on " Episcopacy and Reunion." To the January number of *The Hibbert Journal*[3] M. Couchoud has contributed an extraordinarily stimulating, if unconvincing, article on " The Historicity of Jesus." Starting from the traditional, orthodox view of Jesus, which he holds is based upon grounds of faith alone, he proceeds to reject M. Loisy's theory of apotheosis, or the thesis that Jesus is the name of a man, an historical personage, whom the devotion of His followers transformed by stages into a God, and to build up the converse thesis that Jesus was at first the name of a God, transformed in the second century of our era into the name of a man, and unknown as an historical person until then. In order to arrive at this conclusion M. Couchoud is forced to regard the Pauline Epistles and the Apocalypse as the only first-century documents in the New Testament, and to relegate the composition of the Gospels to the years 135-142 approximately. The Bishop Gore Memorial Lecture on " Dante and the World To-day," by Dr Elliott-Binns, is published in the January issue of *The Modern Churchman*.[4] Those who have an interest in history will find Fr Gordon Albion's article on " Caius of Cambridge " in *The Clergy Review*[5] for February full of information presented in a most attractive and restrained way. The relation of Christianity to modern theories of government is dealt with by Luigi Sturzo in the October number of the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*.[6] Two short articles of more general interest to the parish priest concern " The Influence of Public Opinion " and " The Problem of the Ex-Chorister," to be found respectively in the February *Industrial Christian Fellowship Review*[7] and the January number of *English Church Music*.[8]

CLIFFORD W. DUGMORE.

---

[1] T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh. 10d. [2] Independent Press, London. 2s. 6d. quarterly. [3] Allen and Unwin, London. 10s. per annum. [4] Blackwell. 1s. [5] Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2s. [6] Casterman, Tournai. 40 francs. [7] I.C.F. 1d. [8] S.P.C.K. 6d.

(*b*) Literary

A hundred different reasons are given for the decline of our civilization, and a hundred different remedies proposed, but none of them satisfy. That suggests that the point of decline is one of those elusive points which shift as you reach it, just as it is now known that scientific observation itself disturbs the thing observed. And this is because, says Mr E. W. F. Tomlin in his "Symposium" on "Art and Culture" contributed to the current (January-March) *Purpose*, the disease of our civilization is the corruption of our consciousness, a disease starting in the emotions. A lack of art means the dissipation of the emotions upon politics or crime; whereas art reveals to us our emotions and cures the disease. For those who have not time to read Professor R. G. Collingwood's *The Principles of Art*, on which this essay is based, here is a good short substitute. The theologian need not complain that the "will" is left out of the discussion (there has been too much tendency to limit theology's concern to the region of the will), for doubtless Mr Tomlin would say that the will is left stranded as derelict as the mind by this decay of the imagination. What is important is to note the new sense of urgency and responsibility, arising from discussions of the function of art, which is apparent in articles like this. This sense of responsibility is illustrated in a useful essay on "Auden and Poetic Drama," by Mr Julian Symons, in *Life and Letters To-day*,[1] February, 1939. But even more interesting is a brief note on "Lawrence and the Death Process," by Mr Michael Fraenkel, in the number of *Purpose* already referred to—a remarkable number for a shilling. Mr Fraenkel sees D. H. Lawrence's greatest contribution to be his indication of the death of our civilization. Where he went wrong was to imagine new life only in the regeneration by sex, which soon accumulated romantic ideas around it, romantic ideas of unfettered sex which merely became involved in the same death process. What Lawrence should have done, says Mr Fraenkel, was to have accepted the death as a birth to new life; "he overlooked the sustenance and nurture of death itself." That is a profoundly true judgment of Lawrence, and a profoundly important consideration for us all. But I have no idea what it can mean outside a Christian context and a Christian philosophy of history. Certainly for the Christian the death of a civilization may be at once the judgment of God and the message of redemption for civilization. And perhaps Lawrence after all only just missed seeing the teleological significance of a *Kairos* which would have made him a Christian prophet. This Christian

[1] Published by The Brendin Publishing Co., 26, Maiden Lane, W.C. 2. 1s. monthly.

philosophy of history is the real "clue to history," which Mr J. Middleton Murry backs against Mr J. Macmurray. (See a rather patchy symposium of views on Macmurray's book of that name, in the February *Adelphi*.) "The effect of Macmurray's clue to history on me," says Mr Murry, "is that of one prolonged post-mortem—ending in a post-mortem millennium." And a post-mortem is not a life in death.

W. R. Jarrett-Kerr.

SURVEYS

(A) SOME RECENT BOOKS ON CHURCH HISTORY

Amongst recent books on Church History pride of place may not unjustly be given to Dr H. Maynard Smith's *Pre-Reformation England* (Macmillan, 25s.), a massive and learned survey of existing printed evidence for the condition of the Church in England on the eve of the Reformation. It presents within the compass of a single volume an invaluable and thorough collection of evidence drawn from a great variety and number of sources. The author disclaims all suspicion of original research, and he has certainly shown that history can still be written from printed sources. It may be regretted notwithstanding that curiosity did not lead him to explore some of the manuscript sources for the diocese of Gloucester and the cathedral church which he adorns by his learning. His book will be indispensable for all who desire to estimate the conditions, practical and intellectual, out of which the Reformation in England emerged. This service will remain, even where the reader may not assent to the author's verdicts. Generally speaking, his judgment is conservative, and touched always with a feeling for human infirmities and a generous tendency to give the pre-Reformation clergy, religious and secular, the benefit of the doubt. I am not sure that he does not take too favourable an opinion of the general standard of clerical education and of the discharge of their duty by the secular clergy. Comparatively little is said of the number of wandering mass priests, evoked by the Chantry system and the carelessness of bishops in conferring holy orders, and their resultant influence on the standards of literacy and conduct of the clergy. In describing the religious and intellectual tendencies of the later middle ages, Dr Maynard Smith sees less evidence of a popular repulsion against arithmetical valuations of the efficacy of masses than some writers have done; but he presents a comprehensive and learned survey of his subject. It is greatly to be hoped that he will enjoy the years and leisure necessary to fulfil his ambition to write a companion volume on the actual English Reformation. Such a study is much needed, and if Dr Maynard Smith gives it to us, he will double our gratitude for his present volume, and satisfy the curiosity aroused by it as to why the actual course of the Reformation differed in some respects from the anticipations of *Pre-Reformation England*.

A book of very different character is Mr Frank Dodd's *An Introduction to the Study of Christianity* (George Allen and Unwin, 12s. 6d.). It is designed to appeal to readers who find unpalatable and unconvincing books written either by supporters of an authoritative Church and Bible or by avowed infidels. Its

outstanding characteristic is the individuality of its judgments. Whether they are as reliable as they are individual may be doubted. Thus Mr. Dodd regards the Fourth Gospel as probably from the hand of Lazarus and as presenting the esoteric teaching of Jesus " which it was not desirable to preach publicly." Mr Dodd's own Christology is Adoptionist and he argues that the Apostles' Creed represents this Christology and not the Incarnational theology of classical orthodoxy. This survey of early Christianity is followed by a selective history of medieval and modern Christianity. No objection, of course, can be taken to the selective nature of the narrative. But it is important to ask whether the selection is adequate and representative. Dr Streeter's *The Four Gospels* would seem to be more reliable than Mr Dodd; and it may be doubted whether readers who are attracted to this book by its author's freedom from either orthodox or infidel presuppositions will find in it a satisfactory account of the origins and development of Christianity.

Readers desiring an introduction to the history of the Christian Church would be well advised to turn rather to two admirable small books, *An Outline of Church History from the Acts of the Apostles to the Reformation: The Arrival of Christianity*, and *Christian Culture and Civilization* (George Allen and Unwin, 4s. 6d. each). They represent the B.B.C. talks on Church History for schools (upon which the Religious Director is to be congratulated warmly), and are now issued to a wider audience. It is much to be hoped that they will have a wide appeal. The hour of their delivery, Mondays at noon, though convenient for schools, is highly inconvenient for most other persons, and therefore the talks are probably unknown to most people. These two books may be recommended cordially to university students (most of whom I have found startlingly ignorant of early Church history), to leaders of Church Tutorial classes, to parish clergy anxious to interest their people in the history of the Church, and to laity desirous of informing themselves upon this vital aspect of their religion. The first volume covers the first six centuries of Church history, and the second surveys the achievements of medieval Christianity. The names of the several contributors guarantee the authoritative nature of their lectures, and the reader will not be disappointed. I hope that the sale of these books will be such as to encourage additions to the series. There is one " howler " which the editor, Mrs Duncan Jones, might with advantage remove if a second edition is called for, in the lecture on " The Eastern Church " in the second volume, where the writer in an *obiter dictum* says that the parish system " was introduced into England in the latter part of the seventh century by an archbishop of Canterbury, who was himself a Greek, the great Theodore of Tarsus." This idea is a

generation out of date; for since the work of Ulrich Stutz it has been generally accepted that the parochial system is of pagan and Teutonic origin, being brought by the Germanic invaders of the Roman empire and found in such different regions of their settlement as Scandinavia, Lombardy, France, and Spain as well as England. I should like to iterate my recommendation of these two little books and to wish them a good sale. The chief obstacle to this is their high price. If a cheaper edition at half a crown could be issued, their success should be assured.[1]

One of the objectives of the *Oxford History of England* was to eschew the predominant place given to political history in the older volumes, and to give proper space to religious, intellectual, and social factors. Mr E. L. Woodward's *The Age of Reform*, 1815-1870 (The Clarendon Press, 15s.), will be of especial interest to our readers because of its stimulating chapter on "Religion and the Churches," which should be read by all interested in the origins of the Oxford Movement, not least because the author's judgments differ considerably from those conventionally accepted in Anglican circles. Together with a tribute to the work accomplished by the Evangelical revival, Mr Woodward points out its weakness on the intellectual side and its "failure to understand the social significance of the Church as an institution." He has a revealing phrase on the broad churchmen, "for the most part scholars, whose influence was greater outside than inside the church," and he emphasizes, what writers on the Oxford Movement have been generally reluctant to admit, the interdependence of the ideals of the Tractarians and those of the administrative reformers represented by Blomfield. He points out the quaint anomaly in the association of the beginnings of the Oxford Movement with the defence of privilege and abuse in the Church. Most interesting, however, is his estimate of the three weaknesses of that movement: the prominence given to matters of ceremonial, which introduced a divisive element into the Church unknown to the Caroline Age, its aloofness from the laity, and its intellectual intransigeance. Mr Woodward's survey ends with 1870, and it may be contended with some justice that the social and intellectual horizons of the successors of the Tractarians have widened since that date, though in the theological sphere the majority of their society have not advanced very far.

From The Church Historical Society, Philadelphia, comes Dr E. L. Pennington's useful survey of the career of the *Apostle of New Jersey, John Talbot*, 1645-1727 ($2.50). With the exploration of the S.P.G. archives we may anticipate a number of monographs on the early history of the Anglican missionaries in North

[1] I am glad to be informed by the publishers that a cheap edition in paper covers at 2s. 6d. per volume will be issued this month.

America, and this study is a welcome addition to our knowledge of an important and misunderstood figure. Owing to the lack of episcopal supervision in " The Plantations," Talbot received episcopal consecration from the Non-Jurors, and Dr Pennington establishes the disputed fact of Talbot's consecration. Equally valuable with the sketch of Talbot's life are the collection of his letters printed in this volume, and students of the period will find in them further illustrative detail of its problems.

From the beginnings of the Anglican Church in the New World to the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons in England is a far cry, and the epoch of the Anglo-Saxon conquest remains one of the most obscure in our history. Amongst the " authorities " for its study are the writings of Nennius, and Mr A. W. Wade-Evans has rendered a most useful service to historical students by his introduction to and translation of *Nennius' History of the Britons, together with The Annals of the Britons, and Court Pedigrees of Hywel the Good, also The Story of the Loss of Britain* (S.P.C.K., The Church Historical Society, 7s. 6d.). Mr Wade-Evans has produced a well-annotated and translated version, with a competent introduction, and both editor and publisher deserve the thanks of students for the production of this volume.

The issue to members of the Religious Book Club of a cheap edition of Lord Eustace Percy's *John Knox* is a welcome sign of enterprise, and will bring within the compass of modest purses a biography whose merits were widely recognized at its appearance. Dr S. P. T. Prideaux has published a sermon on *John Prideaux* (Bennet, Salisbury, 1s.), in which he traces the fortunes of his seventeenth-century episcopal ancestor in a manner which makes plain the difficult issues of that time. Students of the Reformation will read with appreciation Mr R. N. Carew Hunt's two articles on Thomas Münzer in *The Church Quarterly Review* for October, 1938, and January, 1939.

N. Sykes.

(B) SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN RUMANIA

This article started with the intention of being on " Some Trends in Rumanian Theology." The change in the title is significant. So far as the writer has been able to discover after a very limited experience, there is nothing which can fairly be called Rumanian theology, and nothing in connexion with religious thought in this country which can be described as a " trend." Religious thought, and most other thought as well, is static. There are points where politics impinge upon religion, but any resultant development is political rather than religious.

The religious outlook and the possible explanation of it are not without interest.

It has its roots in the general educational system. One thing which immediately strikes the observer is the quality of the school buildings. In a country which in its administration is both backward and corrupt, the school buildings are amongst the best and most up-to-date in any town. Education is thorough as far as it goes, but it has no soul. From beginning to end the children are stuffed with facts, and examinations are merely a test, and a severe one, of memory. When the student passes on to the theological seminary, the same method is continued. The lecturer dictates notes which the student takes down and learns by heart, and reproduces in the examinations. It must be remembered also that the bulk of the candidates for ordination are drawn from the peasant class, and that the Rumanian peasant is quite definitely an Oriental. In the final examination the candidates are arranged in three classes, entirely according to the number of facts they have succeeded in amassing. Those in the first class go to the larger town parishes; those in the second to the more important villages; and those in the third to the less important country cures; and there they stay. So far as the present writer has been able to ascertain their " education " is not continued after ordination, and only an infinitesimal number do any independent reading. They eke out their incomes by doing a trade in matches and tobacco, and are often the licensees of the local public house, which may include a dancing saloon. Too much should not be made of this. Rumania is not England, and although it sounds bad, it does not of necessity amount to much more than the running of a village club.

Such a ministry finds itself at home in a Church which is conservative, in which there are no divergences of doctrine, and which possesses an exact and well codified body of canon law. The average English priest, to whom was referred a point of ecclesiastical law, would probably admit that his ideas on the subject were hazy, but would look the point up if he had a book of reference handy. A Rumanian priest could quote the canons applicable to the point, and give references to Holy Scripture and the General Councils. His knowledge, as far as it goes, is definite and exact. He is not interested in doctrinal development or even in restatement. Any approach to constructive thought is Russian in origin, and there is widespread suspicion of much of this. There is a Rumanian translation of Bulgakoff's *Orthodoxy*, which is used in seminaries here.

At Sibiu there is a theological publishing house, which is issuing a certain number of translations and some Rumanian works. So far, in their " seria teologica," ten books have been issued. They are well printed and bound in paper covers, and

Bulgakoff's work, which is the highest in price of the series, costs 150 lei, which at the present (unofficial) rate of exchange is equivalent to about 2s. There is also a " seria didactica " in which eight volumes have been issued. These are either historical or of the textbook variety, and are by Rumanian authors. Secular history in this country tends to be strongly partisan; perhaps Church history is better. *Christ in the School*, *The Gospel in the School*, *The Meaning of Christianity*, and the tracts in the " popular library " series all rather suggest the publications of the Church Literature Society. The authorities in the Rumanian Church have awakened to the fact that a great revival of religion is necessary, and every effort is being made to bring this about. A priest in Bucharest has set up a private printing establishment and is distributing large quantities of simple tracts on elementary Christian doctrine and practice.

The Church is affected by the strong nationalist movement which is taking place. This is not easy for a foreigner to understand after only a limited opportunity for study. The Iron Guard movement either posed as, or actually was in part, a religious revival. It had its roots in dissatisfaction with the present régime, and was probably only pro-German because its leaders knew of no other alternative, and had only the vaguest idea of what was going on in Germany. It was anti-semitic, but so is the whole of Rumania irrespective of party, and this feeling is strong in the Church. But there is no actual persecution of the Jews, and no clamour for it. Nationalism, which is of the nature of a reply to the Iron Guard activity, is also given a religious basis. On the first anniversary of the new constitution, which has just been held, the army and ex-Service men and youth organizations have attended special services, which were described as " Solemn Te Deum." They were conducted in Rumanian, and contained repeated prayers for the King and the government, and were obviously of an official character. Religious *practice* seems to be ingrained in the Rumanians, and no movement which did not take account of this would ever get much hold on them. The problem seems to be to relate in an ignorant and backward peasant people the practice of religion to morals and to life. And this is the problem which the best religious leaders are trying to tackle. And it is by no means peculiar to Rumania.

The progress of the rapprochement between the Rumanian and English Churches is a matter of common knowledge. The attitude of the leaders and the well-informed generally is irreproachable. There is, however, to be met with in some quarters a less sympathetic attitude. One hears it said that it is the Anglican Church which has made the move for purposes of her own, and that if she wants reunion, the obvious way is for her to accept the Orthodox faith, and become incorporated

into the Orthodox Church. Side by side with this there is to be found an appreciation of certain Anglican customs which are not matters of faith, such as the less rigid marriage law for clergy. The rule enforcing marriage on all secular priests and the prohibition of second marriages is felt to press very hardly in some cases, as when a priest is left a widower with small children, and the greater Anglican freedom in this matter is envied. Not very much about this, however, is said on public occasions.

The divergence between the Eastern and Western Church in the realm of moral and ascetical theology is well known in England, and probably there is no difference here between Rumania and the other churches of the East. Rumanian clergy and theologians are acquainted with St Thomas, in outline at all events, but they frankly have " no use " for Western theologians and sometimes are contemptuous of them.

The writer's impression, admittedly after very limited opportunities for observation, is that, although the basis of ascetical theology is different in the East and West, there is a great deal in common between the different methods adopted by the Isichasts and the methods with which we are familiar in England, and which have been so well summarized by Fr Bede Frost,[1] and that the ultimate end is the same.

But we come back to the point from which we started, that there is nothing much here in the nature of development of thought. The accepted ideas are about as old and as stable as the Carpathian Mountains which separate the original Rumania from Western Europe.

H. Chalmer Bell.

[1] In *The Art of Mental Prayer*.

BOOK REVIEWS

HENRY LUKE PAGET. By Elma K. Paget. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

Bishops who really know the working of a parish in virtue of having been parish priests are all too rare; bishops who know, love, and care for the cathedrals in their dioceses are also rare; bishops who eschew the limelight and give themselves up wholly and solely to their pastoral work as chief shepherds of their flocks are rarer still, but Henry Luke Paget was a parish priest who knew, a bishop who cared, a shepherd who nourished and gently led his flock. And bishops are rarely fortunate in their biographers, but in his wife Luke Paget has found a subtle self-effacing interpreter whose pages breathe an atmosphere, a discipline, a life. Paget did not talk about our incomparable prayer book and liturgy; he used it and lived it. Nor did he talk about brotherhood and the corporate life; again, he lived it. His wit disarmed controversy as his humility disarmed praise.

In these days of hurried, careless, and even clumsy preaching, it is inspiring to learn that Paget wrote out his sermons at St Pancras Sunday by Sunday for nineteen years. "There was," his wife rightly observes, in sermons thus lovingly prepared, "discipline, thought and accurate knowledge." In many delightful pages Mrs Paget has let her husband, Luke, as he must be called even by a reviewer, speak for himself. The old home in Henrietta Street and in Harewood Place is vividly recalled, and we realize how much he owed to Sir James Paget, his father, and Lydia Paget, his mother. There it was that, wearing clothes not very attractive but made by a then young Working Tailors' Co-operative Association, he gained those social sympathies and unselfconscious fellowship that remained with him for life and made his Stepney bishopric in the war years so pastoral and apostolic. There it was that music and science entered into his mind and enabled him never to lose a grasp of both the transcendental and the immanental characteristics of divinity. There it was, says his wife, that "he simply could not avoid culture although incidentally it made him a little lazy about education": a suitable comment.

At Oxford he loved Nettleship, but he loved the free stimulating university life more. Yet his vocation for the ministry was never in doubt, and in 1877 he was licensed to St Andrew's, Wells Street, at the age of twenty-five. There he chiefly learnt, he tells us, "quietude and reverence, careful handling of holy things." Three years later he joined the Leeds Clergy School recently founded by Dr Gott, afterwards Bishop of Truro. But little more than a year passed before he went to the Christ Church Mission, "somewhere in Poplar," in 1881. There he

learnt that " kindness is a feeble thing when justice is asked for," an observation even truer to-day than then. Five all too brief years in Poplar were followed by the interlude of one year's incumbency at St Ives, and then began the great work at St Pancras, where Paget remained for the next nineteen years.

It was an unexpected, criticized, but wholly justified appointment. Paget made no enemies, confounded the critics, earned the admiration of Bernard Shaw and the love of all his parishioners. The Elizabeth Garrett Anderson Hospital was a natural object of his solicitude, and Dame Mary Scharlieb one of his warmest friends. But in 1906 this very peripatetic parson moved again, to become Suffragan to Bishop Sheepshanks of Norwich. He had hardly time to settle into his first bishopric before he was translated to Stepney in 1909, but thirty years later a woman leaving the simple message at her own memorial service, " Say I came from Levington," thus illustrated how swiftly and how sincerely this bishop made himself a beloved Father in God.

When Luke Paget went as Bishop of Stepney there were six predecessors, great men he called them, still living. But Archbishop Davidson and the present Bishop of London well knew how worthy a successor Luke Paget was. How Augustinian and how Ambrosian were his greetings now to a ticket collector, " *Sursum corda*," now to a small boy, " 'Ullo, Dick Turpin !" How loving and lofty was his work in the Kentish hop-fields. How natural his friendship with Dick Sheppard as well as with " Dick Turpin." And how right and spontaneous was the appearance in Stepney of war shrines and children's corners in churches—a fragrant prelude to the cathedral days at Chester. Sorrows came to himself; in March, 1918, " Sam " was killed. But Mrs Paget has not told the reader who Sam was, and the absence of an index and a greatly needed chronology leaves us to guess that Sam, like others beloved by Luke Paget, but with more right, could address his father as " Dear Paternity." In 1919 Paget was translated at the age of sixty-six to Chester, and a year later his wife was appointed the first woman J.P. for the City of Chester. " Vive la Justice," he telegraphed to her. At Chester Paget taught his own generation and succeeding ones how a bishop and the dean of his cathedral can live together in joyful unity. His sacerdotal jubilee occasioned a " very great outpouring of love." In 1932 he let go his diocese, but did not let go God. Retiring to a little old house in Cloth Fair in the City of London he became a real beloved physician of souls in his capacity as extra chaplain at St Luke's, Fitzroy Square. He kept abreast of current theology, books of all sorts, and P. G. Wodehouse (there is a misprint on p. 267), and in his last year he broadcast a religious service for the B.B.C. He held a confirmation in his

bedroom not long before he died on April 26, 1937. " See," said an attendant nurse afterwards, " see, his body is as sweet and pure as a child. This was a good man."

ALBERT A. COCK.

COMPARATIVE RELIGION. An Introductory and Historical Survey. By E. O. James. Methuen. 9s.

The comparative study of religions relies for its data on a very wide field of inquiry, in which countless fresh facts have been brought to light in recent times. The need has long been felt for an introductory textbook bringing the old into line with the new, and guiding the student through the main facts and theories according to modern scientific methods. Professor E. O. James, who has already written a great deal on specialized aspects of comparative religion, presents us now with such a textbook in a clear, systematic and readable form.

Most books on the non-christian religions deal with each of the principal religions separately, leaving the student, in a large measure, to make comparisons for himself. Professor James has achieved the difficult task of combining a legitimate historical sequence with the comparative method of bringing together, for closer study, similar beliefs and practices such as those of salvation, sin, atonement, sacrament and immortality. Historically the higher developments are studied in the light of the lower, and cross-sections are made through parallel systems to enable comparisons to be made. In expounding the various beliefs and schools of thought the author has aimed at as sympathetic and detached a standpoint as possible, though he gives the reader a fair statement of his own mature views along many lines of independent research, and a lucid treatment of the uniqueness of Christianity. In his concluding chapter Professor James points out the world-wide appearance of religion, its stabilizing function, its power for progress through new visions of reality, and he shows that religion has not been " other-worldly " to the exclusion of this life's practical needs.

Two minor criticisms in detail occur to us. Is it perhaps better not to speak of " the dualistic system " of Shingon Buddhism (nor strictly of the Ryobu), as the two aspects of " ideal " and " dynamic " are one in the Absolute? Can we affirm, in the exact sense, that Varuna ever " became the one dominant power " in Vedic India, in view of the influence of the militant Indra on the warrior Aryan, as compared with the cold transcendence of the ethical Varuna?

As is to be expected from such a writer as Professor James, this introduction is a reliable and valuable source of information, and is usefully crowned with a good bibliography to satisfy any further hunger for knowledge.

F. HAROLD SMITH.

DOCTRINES OF THE CREED. By Oliver C. Quick. Nisbet. 10s. 6d.

This important work aims at providing an answer, in respect of the main doctrines of the creed, to the question how we are to " understand and interpret the doctrinal tradition of our Church in relation to that particular world in which we are now called upon to uphold the Christian faith."

The author treats his subject under the four main headings of belief in God, the Incarnation, Salvation, and the Holy Spirit and the Church. In the first section he wisely refuses to adopt the traditional sharp distinction between " natural " and " revealed " theology as the exclusive spheres of reason and faith respectively. While maintaining that the " rational " proofs of the existence of God are of practically no value for the establishment of belief in God in the Christian sense, he rightly deprecates the Barthian tendency to glory in irrationality and to refuse altogether to allow Christian faith to appeal to the general reason and conscience of mankind. It is refreshing nowadays to read that " we cannot speak as though the Christian believer moved in a world of specifically religious truth which the philosophic reason is debarred from entering."

The charge of anthropomorphism is successfully opposed, though the reader may feel that a more positive virtue might be claimed for the refined anthropomorphism whereby Christianity avoids making God less than personal and merely the negative Absolute of Hellenic philosophy. A brief and effective reply is made to the familiar objection of Adler and other psychologists that the idea of Divine Fatherhood is a projection of the mind seeking compensation for the adult's loss of parental care.

In dealing with the Incarnation Dr Quick provides a most able and original exposition of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel and " Hebrews." He indicates the inherent weakness of Greek and scholastic theology—its rigid Aristotelian theory of divine impassibility, which virtually precluded belief in a genuine Incarnation. Modern Christological theories are divided into two main types, " Liberal Protestant " and " Kenotic." The former view is criticized as treating Christ as only the revealer of God, not as the performer of a unique act, and hence as lacking the finality of the New Testament theology of the Incarnation—a criticism which often appears to be merited; the latter is defended against the accusation that it is unorthodox (from the primitive Church's standpoint), tritheistic, or " mythological." We are given in the same section an extremely fair summary of the Virgin Birth controversy and the doctrinal arguments urged on either side.

In his discussion of the four main types of Atonement theory the author rejects the " moral " or Abelardian as implying a Pelagian view of sin; the idea of Christ's " victory over evil

powers," popularized by Bishop Aulen, is effectively criticized as crudely mythological if its language is literal, and virtually equivalent to the former theory if it is metaphorical; the Anselmic view is regarded as morally repugnant, and the " sacrificial " theory of Christ's offering of a perfect life as an expiatory sacrifice is upheld. Perhaps the adherent of Abelard will feel that even this view, shorn of all metaphor, is really not far removed from his own misnamed " subjective " theory.

After an excellent summary of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the Church, the theory of apostolic succession is explained as implying the transmission of duly constituted authority, not of " indelible character," and an approach to reunion is suggested, beginning with the admission that every divided church is in schism and needs the reconstitution of a united whole to remedy its defects.

There is a good bibliography. " i Esdras " on p. 243 is a misprint for ii (iv) Esdras.

G. W. H. Lampe.

The Gospel to this Generation. Report of The Church Congress, Bristol, 1938. Edited by M. H. Fitzgerald. Hodder and Stoughton. 2s. 6d.

This book deserves more attention than the reports of Church Congresses usually receive. There was a refreshing breath of realism about the Bristol Congress. A challenge was thrown out—to the clergy of Bristol in particular. It is to be hoped that they have done something definite about this challenge; if not, it will be a sad reflection upon the ability of the Church to stir itself to action.

The Congress program was perhaps over-ambitious, and the report suffers as a whole from a lack of thoroughness in examining the problems. In a few instances those in official positions were over-cautious in making statements; if Christianity is face to face with a crisis, there can be no room for mincing words and sparing feelings. Dr Oldham's paper on " The Content of the Gospel " is the most arresting of all the papers. There is no doubt in his mind that Christianity must rouse itself to deeds. He tells us that " our fundamental need in regard to the content of the Gospel is to rediscover its meaning in living experience "; that our religion appears unreal because doctrine and practice are in fundamental contradiction. He ends by asking, " Can we produce the deed ?"

The papers and speeches on " Intellectual and Practical Difficulties " are good, though the limits of the Congress made a more exhaustive review of these problems impossible. I liked Mr Tomkins's speech with its warning that the Church may be defending trenches which no one is attacking, and his careful

analysis of the root of intellectual difficulty. Mr Elvin's approach to the practical difficulties is also refreshing. The Dean of St Paul's is, as always, clear and concise in stating his reasons for a revision of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Mr Preston, who spoke after the Dean, said that any revision of the Articles on the lines suggested by Dr Matthews would only meet the need of those within the Church, and he too makes out an excellent case for restatement in deeds rather than in words. Both the sections dealing with the " Demand for Restatement " deserve sympathetic study.

No one can accuse the Bishop of Southampton of not saying what he thinks about the " Church Militant." It is a fine fighting paper. The discussion on " Christian Unity " is less satisfactory. A fog seems to have settled over all talk on reunion, and much though I admire the clarity of the Bishop of Coventry's assessment of this question and Dr Reid's views from the Free Church standpoint, I am left with the feeling that on this point at least the Congress made little headway.

Canon Roger Lloyd is more practical in his handling of " The Christian Social Order " than Canon Narborough, who takes his stand on the teaching of the New Testament. Here again, there is evidence that there was insufficient time for a full examination of this vitally important question. It is a pity that the challenge of Christianity is not put in more definite form by Canon Narborough, and that Canon Lloyd felt that he had to confine himself to talking only from the parish point of view, though he manages to quote sufficient instances of un-Christian conduct to shake the complacency of the most self-satisfied of men. Having been in business myself for a number of years I can endorse all that Canon Lloyd says, and strong though his language is, I could wish that it were stronger.

The discussion of the " Christian Way to Peace " is most disappointing. Dr Costley-White's reasoning strikes me as being confused, but this may be due to the influence of the Crisis days, over just before the Congress met. The speech of Mr Porter-Goff on the same subject is much better argued and he puts his points simply and clearly. Canon Thompson Elliott and the Dean of Bristol analyse the " Parochial System," and although a number of people will disagree with some of the things they say, they show courage in attacking the obvious weaknesses of a system which some would like to see drastically reformed.

On the question of " Training for the Ministry," if the suggestions put forward by the Archdeacon of Auckland and Mr Watkins are acted upon, there will be less criticism of the clergy from the man in the street. " Men, Money and the Ministry," on which both the Archdeacon of Northumberland and Mr Loveday speak, is extremely good, particularly the

former's paper. His balanced statements, his use of statistics, and his frankness make it, after Dr Oldham's, the best argued paper in a book which provides much useful material for discussion groups.

M. Armstrong.

Modern Poetry: A Personal Essay. By Louis Macneice. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.

The twenty years which have elapsed since the Armistice have been divided almost exactly into halves so far as English poetry is concerned. The first decade saw the summit of the Georgians with their slow decline of intellectual power and emotional intensity as the War (which had formed so much of their dynamite) receded; and the second witnessed the rise of those political poets who have not yet all had their say, but who seemed to get no hearing at all until T. S. Eliot had split the complacent mould into which the Georgians, as a school, had become so finally "set." The mood of these men—Auden, Bottrall, Day Lewis and Spender—has been one of hard grey disillusionment; and, although Mr Macneice belongs in spirit to what appears to be a New Age in poetry rather than the last, he reverts to the mood of ten years ago when he says that:

"The Georgians, in opposition to the æsthetes, professed to bring back happiness into poetry, but their happiness rings no more true than the fastidious gloom of their predecessors. Thus they idyllized the countryside without being rooted, as nature-poets should be, in their subject (I except a few poets such as Edward Thomas). They are mainly townsmen on excursion. Sometimes they cover up their lyrical eulogies with whimsicality, as Rupert Brooke did in writing about Grantchester. With their narrowness of range and frequent woolliness of thought went an insipid technique. The versification is facile to match the lack of tension in the thought."

This is a hard saying, but I think it stands or falls with Mr Macneice's main contention—that the poet must be the conscience and the critical faculty of the community—not its mouthpiece (for then he would only tell what it already knew) or a wholesale dealer in "escapist" fantasies. This is, I suppose, the function of the prophet; and it was exactly this that the Georgian ceased to be once the war had been stopped and Wilfred Owen was dead. Nevertheless Mr Macneice is not entirely satisfied with those who have succeeded them. He detects too often in the machine-guns of the Auden-Lewis-Spender school the stuttering of a propaganda that is almost known by rote; and appeals for a poetry that is conditioned only "by the poet's life and the world around him."

This determination to avoid the escape of the fantasy-monger

on the one hand and the easy virtue of the propagandist on the other is, we may hope, the spirit that would usher in a new age of English poetry; and certainly the poems of Michael Roberts and Dylan Thomas (not to mention the poetic plays of T. S. Eliot) would lend colour to the theory that this is the specific contribution that the newer poetry is making. Its *morale* is more keen-edged than either the mellow pastorals of the Georgians with their amoral philosophy of nature and of art or the blunted sensibilities of those which followed them; and while it would not be true to say that Mr Macneice has faith in Utopias or looks for an immediate redemption of poetry, at least it may be said that he looks to those who are being prophets as well as poets (or poets in the moral sense) to redeem our age. Even here, however, he stumbles, as when he says:

"The famous obscurity of Eliot can be referred to his technique, but his technique in turn can be referred to his subject-matter, that is to Eliot's own world and so to Eliot himself. Eliot is a person of exceptional book-learning, for when, as he says himself of Donne, an idea is really an experience, it also does tend to bring in Spinoza when he hears the noise of the typewriter. It is not wrong of Eliot to be difficult, because Eliot would be posing if he were easy. Eliot, for all his adherence to the Anglican Church, is essentially one of the few."

It is surely possible to be a member of the Anglican Church and yet to be conditioned by the world around one—at least, to be moved by it enough in will to make one's creative life a medium for the voice of conscience. That is, I take it, Mr Macneice's ideal of a poet; and it must be mentioned that, despite all that he says about the decades that have gone before us, Thomas Hardy and D. H. Lawrence (to mention but two) were martyred in this cause. More deplorable, because more striking, is his apparent failure to see the prophetic element in the more recent poetry of Eliot; but a blemish of this kind, serious as it is, should not obscure the importance of a book which, perhaps more than any other in our age, restores to poetry its right to moral value.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

OUT OF THE SILENT PLANET. By C. S. Lewis. The Bodley Head. 7s. 6d.

It would be a pity if the publishers' description of this as a first novel should cause it to be overlooked that Mr. C. S. Lewis has already written a very fascinating allegory called *The Pilgrim's Regress*. In that book, which has received nothing like the attention that it deserves, there was manifested a combination, all too rare, of a lively and ingenious fancy with an orthodox Christian outlook upon life; there are few things to equal John's interview with the Puritanian Steward ("Better tell a lie, old

chap, better tell a lie. Easiest for all concerned ") or the scene where Uncle George receives notice from the Landlord. The present work is of a different kind, but it is written from an equally uncommon angle. Its theme is the Wellsian one of a voyage to Mars, but the treatment is anything but Wellsian.

The Wellsian tradition in inter-planetary literature is based upon the assumption that the inhabitants of other planets than ours are ruthless super-intelligences, whose only concern with the dwellers on Earth is to exterminate them. Mr Lewis does not see things this way. His Martians—or, as they call themselves, Malacandrans—are very much nicer people than we are, for neither they nor the angel who governs their planet have fallen; their particular interest in the Earth is due to the fact that the Fall has severed its communication with the other heavenly bodies, so that it has become Thulcandra, the Silent Planet. This idea is worked out in a most enthralling way; we must not spoil the reader's enjoyment by describing it here. We will, however, reveal to him that the Malacandrans are of three distinct types—the *hrossa*, who are the food-producers and poets, the *séroni* or intellectuals, and the *pfifltriggi* or mechanics; there are also the almost invisible and semi-angelic *eldila*. Oyarsa, the angel of the planet, presides over them all.

Perhaps the most delightful passage in the book is that in which the Wellsian scientist, Weston, expounds his philosophy to Oyarsa. The absurdity of scientific humanism can rarely have been more devastatingly demonstrated than it is here, by the simple method of translating it from the jargon of the scientist into words of one and two syllables.

This is an altogether satisfactory story, in which fiction and theology are so skilfully blended that the non-Christian will not realize that he is being instructed in theology until it is too late. It is excellent propaganda and first-rate entertainment. We need more books like this.

E. L. Mascall.

Church-Builders of the Nineteenth Century: A Study of the Gothic Revival in England. By Basil F. L. Clarke. With a preface by Sir Charles Nicholson. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

There are probably few contemporary churchmen who have not indulged their little joke at the expense of the Gothic restorations and church-building of the last century, and against the leaders of this crusade. It will profit all, if, like the present reader, they study carefully Mr Basil Clarke's volume before venturing further upon judgments in this matter. He has written an admirable study of the great achievement of the nineteenth century in church-building.

At the outset he does justice to the eighteenth-century churches, the style of which had become a byword with their successors. He is well aware of their weakness, but also of their virtues. Similarly with "the Commissioners' churches," built at the end of the Napoleonic wars, which represent a determined and praiseworthy attempt to grapple with similar problems, though on smaller scale, with those of to-day. He then sketches with amusing pen the rise of the vogue of Gothic architecture, and the endeavour to identify it exclusively with Christian architecture, and to exclude foreign Gothic from the eyes of English churchmen. His accounts of the Cambridge Camden Society and of the *Ecclesiologist* are informative and entertaining; and he does justice to the virtues of Pugin whilst not concealing his weaknesses. A chapter is devoted to Sir Gilbert Scott, and the volume concludes with surveys of the work of other architects of the late nineteenth century, and of the amount of work accomplished by churchpeople both in new building and restoration.

The outstanding virtues of Mr Clarke's book are its abundance of information, its pleasant style, and its illustrations. They combine to make a volume well worth reading and most interesting. Mr Clarke has gathered his information from a very wide variety of sources. His judgments are piquant and individual, and he has presented a thorough yet critical survey of a vital period of church-building and restoration. Whether regarded from the standpoint of the ecclesiologist or from that of the church historian, this book fills a gap, and presents an entertaining and useful survey of its subject. The present reader has gleaned from its pages equal profit and pleasure.

N. Sykes.

A History of Europe: 911-1198. By Z. N. Brooke. Methuen. 16s.

Anyone who seeks to interest himself in the history of his own parish is bound to study it, not in isolation, but in the context of the history of the national Church of England; and for this purpose Wakeman's *History of the Church of England* can still render him yeoman service. But the history of the Church of England must itself be studied in the context of the history of the Universal Church in which it is in some sense an episode; nor can the history of the Universal Church itself be isolated from its secular environment. Therefore the study of Church History, however widely or however narrowly conceived, requires to be assisted by such authoritative textbooks as this which now lies before us. Dr Brooke's volume on the period from 911 to 1198 is indeed a notable addition to a series (Methuen's History of Mediæval and Modern Europe) already

distinguished by the contributions of Professor Previté-Orton (1198-1378) and Mr Reddaway (1715-1814).

The promise of the Carolingian Empire was soon exhausted, and when the tenth century opened, the outlook of Western Christendom was gloomy and its condition perilous. Recovery came first in the sphere of politics, with the revival of the Empire under the new German Monarchy; then in the sphere of religion, culminating in the assertion of the independence of the spiritual power and the development of the monarchical organization of the Church; then in the economic sphere, marked by a general improvement in rural conditions and by the revival of commerce and of urban life; and lastly in a literary and artistic renaissance, especially in France. These four revivals reached their fruition in the twelfth century. But this new vitality gave birth to discord and to conflict: the struggle between the Empire and the Papacy, the clash between Christendom and Islam and between Latin and Byzantine Christendom, and economic conflict, particularly among the cities of North Italy. If Europe in the thirteenth century was politically quite unlike the Europe of twelfth century, it is because, at the end of this period, the situation was " catastrophically " altered by the deaths of the Emperor Henry VI and of Richard I of England, by the violent establishment of a Latin Empire at Constantinople, and by the decisive victory of the Christians over the Moors in Spain.

Such is the ground covered by this volume. From our point of view, attention may be drawn particularly to the chapters on the Revival of Christianity (culminating in the reform of the Papacy itself) and on Ecclesiastical Life and Learning. But the volume as a whole is a masterpiece of clarity and of compression, and it may be enthusiastically recommended as a handbook to the period. Like all the volumes in this series, it is infinitely more than a mere textbook, although it may serve the purpose of a textbook. It is, in fact, quite transparently a work of real intellectual distinction on the part of a scholar who has already earned our gratitude by his Birkbeck Lectures on *The English Church and the Papacy:* 1066-1200, and by his labours as an editor of the *Cambridge Medieval History.*

C. H. S.

AGAPE AND EROS. By Anders Nygren. Part II. S.P.C.K. Vol. I, 6s.; Vol. II, 7s. 6d.

The work of the well-known Swedish theologian Dr Nygren will require no introduction to English readers. The first part of his studies in the New Testament conception of love was translated some years ago. The succeeding portions of his work have now been prepared for the English-reading public by the Rev. P. S. Watson, of Wesley College, Leeds. The

author has continued his research upon the idea of love into the field of Christian doctrine. He shows the manner in which this characteristic idea shaped the development of the doctrine of God and the confusions which attended its influence from the beginning. The idea arose from three initial motives, that of the Old Testament *Nomos*, that of *Eros*, the Hellenistic idea, and that of *Agape*, the motive of the New Testament. In the post-apostolic age it would be true, generally speaking, to say that the New Testament idea is predominant but, owing to the mixture of motives and origins which underlie the Christian conception of love, there is no pure type; one theologian leans in one direction whilst another will probably draw his inspiration from a different original motive. For example, the First Epistle of Clement of Rome contains a well-known hymn to love. It would be true to say that contemporary Christian thought was largely influenced by the thought of the Divine love, drawn from the *Agape* motive, but Clement is clearly guided by the Old Testament idea of the *Nomos*.

The Christian idea of love was Hellenized, although the Old Testament played too large a part in the mind of the post-apostolic Church to allow of other influences than that of the *Nomos* predominating among the Apostolic Fathers, even though there was present a constant desire to interweave the characteristic ideas of the Old and of the New Testaments. The Apologists show a battle within the Church of *Agape* and *Eros*, as Dr Nygren brings a wealth of evidence to illustrate. Gnosticism marks a real departure, for in it the *Eros*-motive was predominant. This significant fact might well be read in the light of the assertion of the late Professor Burkitt, that the only Gnosticism concerning which a fund of knowledge is available is an early Christian heresy. It forms a good illustration of the extent to which oriental syncretism and theosophy had permeated the Christian Church. The *Nomos* type rose again in Tertullian, Marcion rediscovered the idea of *Agape* as did Irenæus, whilst the Alexandrian theologians held to the *Eros*-motive. This second phase of Christian doctrine ended in compromise. Theology has woven *Eros* and *Agape* together by raising up the human to the standard of the Divine.

The theology of Augustine inherited this compromise and was designed to complete the synthesis. He was an eclectic who was influenced by the border-lines of two worlds, that of Hellenism, the world of *Eros*, and the primitive Christian thought of the Divine Love, *Agape*. The first had guided his religious development, but the second formed a basic factor in his religious outlook. Although his theology should be considered in the light of the *Confessions*, yet Augustine had brought a good deal of his own religious past into the positions for which he had come to contend as a Christian theologian. His initial thought of

love took dogmatic form in *Caritas*, the ascent to God, whilst his theology became one of *Caritas* and *Gratia*, human ascent and Divine descent. *Amor sui* is right only if it means to love oneself in God and, as the commandment shows, it must include a love for one's neighbour. The adoption of such principles allowed Augustine to work out a synthesis of the idea of love, but it was a synthesis which would not have been recognized by a primitive Christian with a more limited range of ideas.

During the Middle Ages, the *Eros*-motive was still alive, having passed from the Neo-Platonists to Erigena, but the synthesis was still possible because Christianity remained a *Caritas*-religion. It had three heavenly ladders, those of merits, speculation, and mysticism. Faith was regarded as formed by love. A significant side-light upon medieval religion is shown in the revival of the *Eros*-doctrine which took place in certain nunneries, a romantic yearning based upon a sublimation of earthly sensual love. Likewise also, Suso, Tauler, Bernard of Clairvaux, and to some extent Thomas à Kempis, show another side of contemporary piety. A love based upon the sufferings and death of Christ produced a passion-mysticism, one of the guiding principles for many of the mystical thinkers of the Middle Ages.

The *Caritas*-synthesis broke down with the close of the Middle Ages. The sixteenth century was marked by the rise of humanism as a dominant motive in thought. New views of man and a new realization of progress as a guiding motive in human destiny caused a renewed stress upon *Eros*. All love, whether that of God or of man, became self-love. Man came to be regarded as fundamentally a Divine being. The Reformation was not the child of this movement but a parallel movement thrown up by the disturbances of the times. To Luther, the system of *Caritas* had broken down. He regarded the heavenly ladders as mistaken in their form. Merit, rationalism in religion, and mysticism, were alike rejected. His religion was one of *Agape*-love, an attempt to revive the New Testament religion and to set aside the centuries of growth. Dr Nygren ends his research by remarking that, whilst Catholicism had sought the synthesis, to Luther God is *Agape* because he has come to us in His Son.

The importance of such a piece of theological research cannot be over-estimated, for it forms one of the most significant commentaries upon the history of doctrine which it would be possible to produce. The work ends with Luther, an illustration of the fact that Continental Protestants habitually seek to show their loyalty to their own great reformer. But, owing to historical causes, English theologians have never felt themselves bound to the same extent by the ideas of the sixteenth century. It would be possible to contend, on the basis of Dr Nygren's work, that New

Testament categories were progressively overshadowed until Luther forced attention back to them and set aside the rival conceptions which had gradually adhered to Christian theology. Karl Barth, for example, would certainly refuse the heavenly ladders to the Divine Love which were accepted by the medieval theologians. But the question might well be raised whether the present is not in urgent need of some restatement of the medieval synthesis of *Agape* and *Eros* which would do justice to an increasing knowledge of the world. It is true that the semi-pelagianism of the Renaissance period, which emerged into the centuries of liberalism, has broken down. The modern world demands some other explanation than faith in the spirit of man. But Barthianism is likewise one-sided. It reminds its hearers of the meaning which Luther attached to the incarnation of the Divine Agape, but it ignores the centuries of religious experience. Its treatment of human religious mysticism is an unjustifiable sacrifice. It is apt to forget that, if Divine overruling is the characteristic note of Biblical theology, yet Christian doctrine has tempered transcendence with immanence through its teaching upon the indwelling of Christ in the Church. Once again, as in the second century, *Agape* and *Eros* are standing in antithesis, and once again they call for synthesis, for experience is a constant witness to the reality of both.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.

Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels. By P. Gardner-Smith. Cambridge University Press. 5s.

Professor Dodd has described the understanding of the Fourth Gospel as " one of the outstanding tasks of our time." The starting-point for such an understanding is the relation between the author and the tradition which lay behind him: if it can be shown that he knew the Synoptic Gospels, then we have some criterion by which to appraise his object in writing and the extent to which he allowed himself to remould the tradition. Hitherto scholars have been in general agreement that he knew Mark, that he probably knew Luke, but that he did not know Matthew, and that his gospel is a rewriting of the Synoptic material, with the aid of a wider circle of information, in order to draw out what he believed to be its significance. Mr Gardner-Smith questions these conclusions. He contends that literary dependence of one document upon another is not to be assumed until all other explanations have been proved inadequate, and that to see signs of such dependence in occasional verbal parallels is justifiable in comparing the Synoptists with one another—since their literary relationship is established beyond question—but unjustifiable in comparing the Synoptists

with John where the case is not proven. Form-criticism has shown that the gospel material was handed down orally for some years and became to some degree stereotyped in the process, so that identical phrases might be preserved in independent lines of tradition. For example, is the sentence "Take up thy bed and walk" (John v, 8) proof that the author had read Mark ii, 9, when such a phrase might become attached to almost any story of the healing of an impotent man by Jesus and when even the vulgar word for "bed" may have belonged to the vocabulary of the early Church (Acts v, 15; ix, 33)? The story of the Feeding of the Five Thousand may have been one of the most frequently repeated stories in any church; are the verbal contacts between the Johannine and Markan versions to be explained by literary dependence when there is so much that is dissimilar in them? Mr Gardner-Smith goes over the whole ground and concludes that the evidence nowhere proves literary dependence, but that in view of the wide differences and at times unnecessary contradictions between John and the Synoptists, it is more reasonable to suppose that he is relying on an independent tradition. At the end of the book he hazards, but does not develop, the suggestion that John and Mark may have written as contemporaries, since a more advanced theology need not indicate a late date but only a more developed mind working upon material which had taken shape in a more developed environment.

The evidence for a judgment either way is scanty and depends on a number of small points. Form-criticism has shaken confidence in the ability to estimate one author's dependence upon another by a mechanical method of counting the words which they have in common, and it is doubtful whether this question can be settled by literary criticism alone. A gospel which contains no parables, demoniacs, Pharisees or publicans, and which replaces short aphoristic sayings by long articulated discourses, is in any case the product of a radical transformation of the traditional material, whether the material came by way of the Synoptists or not. It is the work of a single mind rather than of a community—for a community does not produce elaborate discourses or stories as long as the Raising of Lazarus—and it is stamped with a distinctive style and vocabulary very close to that of the First Epistle. Hence the mere occurrence of any verbal contacts with Mark at all is in itself a striking fact, and some will still think that at certain points—*e.g.*, the Anointing at Bethany—it requires more than oral tradition to account for it. If the gospel could be assigned to any definite decade this would probably decide the question; certainly a date contemporary with Mark would make the history of its acceptance in the Church difficult to explain. Mr Gardner-Smith has shown that the case for John's use of the Synoptists is less certain

than was supposed, and even if his thesis should not win general acceptance it indicates that the Johannine problem is a theological and not a literary problem, in which the chief question is: "Has the author extracted the true significance from the primitive Christian tradition as we know it from the other sources?"

C. F. Evans.

The Unity of Philosophical Experience. By Étienne Gilson. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

It was reasonable to expect that a series of William James Lectures would sooner or later look for some unity beneath the "varieties" in human life, and Professor Gilson has taken the opportunity of doing so. He claims to find a philosophical pattern recurring in the history of thinkers and thinking—and in the course of his discussions he examines three examples, the Medieval, the Cartesian and the Modern. Each of these, significantly, he follows to "the breakdown," and then completes his study with the comments that "the most striking of the recurrences . . . is the revival of the philosophical speculation by which every sceptical crisis was regularly attended," and that "the so-called death of philosophy being regularly attended by its revival, some new dogmatism should now be at hand." But is this news really as cheerful as it sounds? If philosophers in this wise repeat each other, thinking men will be in bondage to an "abstract philosophical necessity"—it is the lecturer's expression—and not, as philosophers have been in the habit of informing us, the free, spontaneous devotees of truth. How, then, will timid inquirers be coaxed into exploring the high-roads and uncharted spaces of metaphysics? Under the illusion that he follows "wherever the argument leads" the tiro will on this showing be merely assisting at the running down of a repeated cycle. And the determined cycle of processes appears to be this: the ruin of philosophy, religion built upon the ruins; the ruin of religion, philosophy built upon the ruins; the ruin of philosophy . . .

Such may be the upshot of M. Gilson's interpretation. But the subject is not of this depressing sort. Reason, like love, is triumphant in its own right, and the conclusion which the lecturer reaches by his historical *détour* is not unlike Aristotle's statement to which he refers: "To prove philosophy one has to philosophize, and to disprove philosophy one still has to philosophize" (p. 34). Perhaps this could have been discovered more satisfactorily by the short-cut of metaphysics. The professor's historical allusions are attractive in themselves, but they lack decisiveness and fail to guard him from the danger of which he himself is aware, that "the pitcher went once too often to the

well." Reason's reliability is self-guaranteed, independent of *a priori* arguments.

The book is a pleasure to read, written in a colloquial style and peppered with enjoyable epigrams—" There is more than one excuse for being a Descartes, but there is no reason whatsoever for being a Cartesian" (p. 7), " it is not easy to start a new idea, but it is still more difficult to stop it" (p. 290). The lecturer's nationality is naively revealed by a family of *émigré* words including " logicism," " theologicism," " mathematicism," " historicism." But these will not repel the Englishman who reads as far as the reminiscence on page 165: " A few years ago, when a severe storm had cut off all traffic between Great Britain and the rest of Europe, the London *Times* summed up the tragedy in this simple headline: *Continent Isolated.*" M. Gilson is one of the foreign thinkers of to-day who are doing much to break the insularity of British thought by competent and penetrating studies of the great men of the medieval schools, and this slight volume may tempt readers to turn to his larger and more scholarly works.

W. W. S. March.

Philema Hagion. By Karl-Martin Hofmann. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. Geb. M. 7.50.

This is a typical example of the thoroughness of German scholarship. It began as a Seminar paper on the Kiss of Peace in the Christian liturgies, and was extended into a dissertation for the author's Lic. Theol. The thesis traces back the use of the kiss as a religious act in primitive religion (including ancient Mexico), as a means by which divine power is communicated from the deity or the object (sacred stone or pillar, etc.), in which the deity manifests himself, to the worshipper. My only question is whether the original conception is not that of an act by which the worshipper conveys strength to the fetish which might otherwise lose its potency. The author recognizes that the practice cannot be traced in the religion of the Hellenistic world at the time of the N.T. On the other hand, he seems to me to underrate the probability that its origin is to be sought in the general social life of the Hellenistic world, in which it is quite well authenticated. Hence his claim that its origin is to be sought in the primitive conception of the kiss as an exchange of spiritual power seems to overstate his point. That the liturgical Kiss of Peace is an exchange of the spiritual power of love which resides in the community is undoubtedly true; but it seems more probable that the origin is a social custom, whose new meaning is drawn from the general sense of the presence of the Spirit in the community than that it bears any conscious relation to the more primitive view. Later Christian

writers show how easily the quasi-sacramental liturgical act could revert to a more primitive and "magical" conception; but it is unsafe to suppose that the more "primitive" beliefs of the patristic age can be read into the New Testament.

The author has, however, provided a very interesting collection of beliefs and practices surrounding the use of the kiss in religion, which he continues into the post-Reformation period, where it appears in the Brüdergemeine in the middle of the eighteenth century. I know of no work which conveys so much information on this liturgical detail in so small a compass; the author is generous in his quotations and provides an excellent set of indexes.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

AMOR DEI. By John Burnaby. The Hulsean Lectures, 1938. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

"There is no denying the soundness of the instinct which finds obedience a safer term than love by which to denote the right relation of man to his Maker." These are Mr Burnaby's own words (p. 311), and they force on him the problems which he studies by means of an examination of St Augustine's teaching on the love of God. Dare man speak of his love for God? Mr Burnaby, following St Augustine, is sure that he can. "'Distinguer,' dit Despréaux, 'distinguer, morbleu, distinguer, distinguer si nous sommes obligés d'aimer Dieu!'" (p. 2).

But does the word then mean what it means in ordinary life? Is it *Eros* or *Agape*, or both? Is not true love disinterested, and can we so love God when we seek happiness at His hands? And does God desire and delight in our love of Him? The simple Christian, like Despréaux, may be horrified at the thought that he cannot, and is not even called to, love God. His instinct, I hope, is right; but there are problems which the thinker must face. Some of them, particularly the dual aspect of conduct as doing one's duty and pursuing one's good, are the theme of Professor de Burgh's recent Gifford Lectures, *From Morality to Religion*, which might well be read together with Mr Burnaby's book.

In a chapter entitled "The Embarrassment of the Anti-mystic," the author engages in a preliminary skirmish with the work of Professor Macmurray and Dr Nygren, "two strongly-contrasted types of contemporary Christianity, both of which, for different reasons, appear to give no place to the love of God known to St Augustine and to every great Christian mystic." He then expounds certain Neo-Platonist conceptions which deeply influenced Augustine. Then come six chapters on Augustine's own thought, followed by a brief consideration of the theme of disinterestedness in the writings of several Christians, from

St Bernard to Bishop Butler. The book ends with an eloquent presentation of the analogy of man's love for man, an analogy so valuable, yet so inadequate; for " our chief need is to know that . . . what is impossible with men, the complete penetration of spirit by spirit, is possible with God " (p. 313).

Studies of Augustine are sometimes based on but a portion of his works, and take little account of the development which must occur when a man thinks and writes for over forty years on grace and the love of God. But Mr Burnaby has read Augustine closely. Indeed, the index of citations covers 12 pages. In general he upholds Augustine's attempt—so some criticism might run—to have it both ways. Man should both seek his own happiness in God and love God for God's own sake. This arises out of the nature of God, who is Love, who loves His creatures, willing that they should find their true nature, and therefore their happiness, in His gift to them of His own self, a prevenient gift which evokes true love and effects a real union of God and man. Man therefore loves God for what He *is*, yet cannot but know that he finds happiness in God's love for him, in the satisfaction of his best desires. This duality is inherent in the situation, willed by God Himself, and there is nothing blameworthy in such love. " For Augustine the question of ' disinterestedness ' never arose at all. Pure love, *castus amor*, is the desire of God only, but it is the desire of God. God is *gratis amandus*, but He is *ipse nobis præmium* " (p. 256).

The more to dispel the fear that such love is selfish, Mr Burnaby particularly insists on Augustine's perception that the Summum Bonum, the enjoyment of God, is " a good which can be possessed only by being shared " (p. 127), as when he says of Fénelon (whether justly or not, I am not competent to say), " His *beatitudo* is always *privata beatitudo*. He shows no sign of realizing that Augustine's finest achievement was the demonstration that there can be no such thing " (p. 293).

At times, of course, the author cannot follow Augustine. He regards his theory of punishment and of the Atonement as defective (chapter 7) and his ideas of the self-sufficiency and omnipotence of God as too rigid (*e.g.*, on pages 166 and 230). He criticizes, though mildly, Augustine's use of the term " merit " (chapter 8), and rather wishes that he had allowed of suffering in God (pp. 205 *f.*; *cf.* 306 *f.*).

Though Mr Burnaby writes attractively, the stubbornness of the problems makes his book hard reading at times. But perseverance is richly rewarded. There will be objections. The author is well aware that many now condemn his whole position. Details, too, are provocative. For example, " to be convinced of goodness " is doubtless a stage towards love, but can we say at once that it *is* love without much reducing the meaning of love (p. 312)? And is it true that " if to our

partial vision there is more of God here than there," the inequalities are only *apparent*? I may have failed to see more serious objections, for I am conscious of close sympathy with Mr Burnaby's point of view. I have seen this book reviewed somewhat sharply. Upon me, it made a quite different impression. I closed it grateful not only for much mental stimulus, but also for true spiritual food.

S. L. Greenslade.

Problems in Modern Education. Edited by E. D. Laborde. Cambridge University Press. 8s. 6d.

This book is a collection of the addresses that were delivered at the third Conference of Young Public Schoolmasters at Harrow; and for this reason the book is rather a collection of heterogeneous, thought-provoking essays than an integral exposition of modern educational thought and practice. In the nature of the case it is addressed to the staffs of the Public boarding schools, and has the difficulties and responsibilities of these institutions particularly in view. The first four essays set out to deal with some personal and social commitments of assent to the Christian religion; the second part of the book is devoted to certain specialist lines of experiment and development in the training of the adolescent.

The attitude of the first two contributors, Sir Cyril Norwood and Dr Inge, is avowedly Liberal Evangelical; that is to say, the nature and function of the Church are minimized, and Christianity is treated rather as a code of morals, by a universal adherence to which we are to look for the ushering in of the Kingdom of God on earth. One feels that it is too late in the day to put trust in a " social goodwill fostered in the school and issuing therefrom in action," or, again, to yoke Christianity to the liberal democracy of the British Empire, as in the sentence, " Our country is worth living in just because at bottom it is still Christian." Dr Inge's wit and wisdom remain as piquant as ever, but his message to schoolmasters of to-day is weakened by a too persistent confidence in the cultural *cursus honorum* of our grandfathers and the Ciceronian ideal of *otium cum dignitate*.

Mr Macmurray sets out in a new and clear light the impasse that we have reached by our Liberal policy in religious education. What is needed now is not the cultural background afforded by a study of the Scriptures but a general infection of all our studies with the Hebraic theory of history. The question, What is the Jewish background and theory of history which our pupils must assimilate? is well answered in the next essay, by Dr Parkes; he, however, in his emphasis on the Messianic Age seems to understress Jewish teaching about the New Israel. But his main point is none the less true, that the results of the bitter separation

of Christianity from Judaism are unhappy and regrettable characteristics of the modern ethos.

In the secular part of the book Mr Duckworth sets out the history of the modifications in Public-school curricula during this century. Dr Schwarz explains from the psychologist's angle the requisites of, and the reactions to, a training in responsibility. Professor Clarke sounds a timely warning of the obligations entailed by true freedom, " a terrible thing in its ultimate demands, and a high achievement rather than an easy gift." Dr Howe's essay on Education and Vitality is a highly technical plea for the development of the whole personality, based on a faculty-psychology with metaphysical commitments and pleading for a sterner, more austere ideal, to supplant the quasi-modernists' " Follow nature and thou shalt not err." Mr Sauerwein draws our attention to an important experiment that too often goes unheard-of. He is a collaborator in the experiment in International education at Montana College on the Zugerberg, where cosmopolitanism is not mistaken for internationalism and where a really effective League of Nations seems to exist in embryo. Mr Johnston voices the plea of preparatory schoolmasters for reform in curriculum. Mr G. W. Murray advances the plans for Physical Education which have been adopted by the Board of Education largely in the light of the experiments made at Mill Hill, where Mr Murray is now Director of Physical Education.

So far as a unity can be given to the book, this is given in Mr S. H. Wood's concluding address, which is a model of good learning, thoughtful judgment, and Christian inspiration. In this mosaic there is no one, be he schoolmaster or merely sometime schoolboy, who will not find a gem worth his contemplation and stimulating to his life and thought. The book is short, but every essay is a model of compactness and close reasoning. Not a word is wasted; and the balance is perfectly preserved between the practical and theoretical approaches.

R. G. Lunt.

SHORTER NOTICES

In the preface to *This Business of Living* (S.C.M. Press, 5s.) Canon Grensted remarks that he is uncertain whether his book is " a study in psychology, in philosophy, or in practical everyday living." This provides the clue to his argument. The uncomfortable state of division in personality can be cured only by the provision of a master-sentiment which integrates the whole of life. It might be added that the test of such integration is whether an essay in psychology appears as a study in philosophy and at the same time a guide to practical everyday living.

A general statement of the problems of life and their conventional cures acts as an introduction to an examination of the nature of man. Man has to become other than he is, and he is brought before science, art and religion, in order that they may attempt to transform him.

The answer is found in the surrender of the personality to Christ. William Blake once wrote, " The vision of Christ that thou dost see is my vision's greatest enemy," and this deeper question is unanswered though it is recognized—" If we want to know what our religion really is, the simplest test of all is just to ask what we are doing in and with our lives."

ALAN LEEKE.

Dr Rasvihary Das's *The Philosophy of Whitehead* (James Clarke, 6s.) gives within a manageable compass a clear and fair summary of the main points of Professor Whitehead's philosophical system. The author has shown his discrimination and appreciation of the real work of Professor Whitehead by selecting *Process and Reality* for his main treatment. Readers without any philosophical training may well wonder what it all is about, but those who know a little philosophy and who either want an indication of the main points of Professor Whitehead's philosophy or a grasp of it, say for examination purposes, would do well to read Dr Rasvihary Das's book. One of its most interesting parts is the penultimate chapter, in which the author writes critically and independently of Professor Whitehead's philosophy; the chapter is most appropriately called " Some Difficulties."

GRETA HORT.

ART EXHIBITIONS

"A DILEMMA"

CONSTRUCTIVIST ART. By Ben Nicholson. Alex. Reid and Lefèvre, Ltd. ARTISTS' INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION, 1939 Exhibition. Whitechapel Art Gallery, High Street, E. 1.

These exhibitions provide interesting examples of two tendencies in modern art, both of which, while having great religious significance, seem destined by their environment to lead nowhere.

Ben Nicholson's art consists purely of arrangements of squares, oblongs and circles, generally in low relief, and sometimes painted in primary colours. It might be thought that this is just the latest fashion, of no more significance than the length of ladies' skirts, were it not the culmination of a long development. This originated before the War in the formal simplification

practised by Cézanne, diverged in the wonderful work of Seurat and Léger, and has finally reached its logical conclusion in this " Constructivism." The process of this development has been the continual elimination of everything that is personal, or human, or naturalistic, leaving nothing behind but simple geometrical shapes and pure colours. " Geometrical art " is not unique to our generation, but hitherto it has always been popularly supposed that the simplicity of, for instance, Egyptian, Archaic Greek, and Byzantine art was due to lack of skill. But surely it is not that the artist is *unable* to express human and naturalistic characteristics, but that he just does not *want* to do so. It is tempting to think that the fundamental motive prompting this scorn of human and earthly superficialities in art is identical with that which prompts the emphasis in modern theology on the transcendence of God and the insignificance of man (*e.g.*, Barthianism). Similar comparisons can be made between the " theology " and art of the above periods in the past.

But this " constructivist art " appears to be far too remote from religion for it ever to join forces and become really powerful. This is because it is in the grip of a closed system having a chronic lack of purposefulness. Practically all that can happen to a modern work of art is, first to be displayed in some West End gallery around which " cultured " society parades in a singularly futile way, secondly to be added to some rich man's collection with which he does nothing more than clutter up his house, and finally, the greatest honour, to be dumped in some dismal mausoleum eternally smelling of floor polish, which is called a public gallery. It is as though motor-cars only existed in showrooms; as if birds were only made to be stuffed in glass cases. It is impossible that art can have any real future if it continues in such an environment.

The exhibition at the Whitechapel Art Gallery perhaps corresponds to that other movement in modern theology, namely sociology. It is being held by the Artists' International Association, " as a demonstration of the Unity of Artists for Peace, Democracy, and Cultural Development." The works are of all types, ranging from large-scale abstractions to little landscapes in water-colour; there is no obvious political bias, and the artists range from the most famous to the unknown (it is grand to find the identity of artists at last becoming of secondary importance again). The foreword to the catalogue says: " . . . artists have, through no fault of their own, become isolated from the greater part of the society which supports them . . . and the man in the street seems to have lost curiosity in us " (the same might be said of the Church). The general lay-out of the exhibition and the social interests in many of the pictures are therefore calculated to bring the artists'

" possible usefulness to the attention of as wide a public as possible " (some of the titles are, for instance, " The Horrors of War "—transcriptions of Goya's famous etchings; " Pennies from Heaven "—*i.e.*, a slot-machine arcade; and " Miners' Documentary "). The foreword concludes: " Artists believe they could still be useful. They are trying to find out how."

But, as is pointed out by Mr S. John Woods in the March *London Bulletin* (a surrealist publication), " taking art to the street corner for nourishment and applause . . ." is tending " to be blind to the social and spiritual functions of art; . . . the necessity for some sort of action in defence of the artist's liberty is a real one and not to be ignored—but there is a danger of its becoming an excuse for an artist to turn his back on the very difficult problems confronting him as an artist, and to find an escape from these problems in making his art the handmaiden (too often the chambermaid) of politics " (this has obviously happened in other countries). " Let us face the fact that there is no social place for art to-day or on the immediate morrow."

Art therefore knows itself to be in a thorough dilemma. If it tries to maintain its present purity in isolation, it will degenerate and become anæmic like a hothouse plant (there are many signs of this already); if it goes to the people, it will degenerate by prostitution, and become like the growth of weeds.

In the same article Mr Woods also tells us that the modern artist cannot take his works to the people because " the real level of the mass-unconscious is found in the Christmas editions of the illustrated papers and in the decoration of cinemas. Only in a society which is a spiritually unified whole, such as primitive societies or the Middle Ages in Europe, can art express the mass-unconscious and appeal to the masses." But there is still a society which claims to be a spiritually unified whole, and this is the modern Church. Art in the service of the Church (*not* as religious propaganda, but as a WORSHIPFUL activity) would not only find a patron in all the people who go to church, but would also be protected from ulterior motives by being done before God—the God who utterly despises sectional " creeds " and bad work of any kind.

Present conditions are not, however, very promising. The writer happened to go straight from a Service for the Consecration of Bishops in Westminster Abbey, to the Whitechapel Exhibition. It would be depressing and painful to dwell on the contrast between the vitality displayed in the Art Gallery and the dullness of the cobwebby ceremony in the Abbey. But we understand that in the little church of Newlyn in Cornwall, and perhaps elsewhere, Dod Proctor and other painters are even now achieving something of the new synthesis we envisage.

GILBERT N. WALTON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: L. A. Reid, *Preface to Faith* (6s.).

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE: A Catholic Woman Doctor, *Growing Up: A Book for Girls* (1s.); H. Clérissac, O.P., *The Spirit of St Dominic* (6s.); Philip Hughes, *A Popular History of the Church* (7s. 6d.); Edward Leen, *The True Vine and its Branches* (7s. 6d.); Jules Lebreton, *History of the Dogma of the Trinity* (15s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: B. Blackstone, *The Ferrar Papers* (21s.).

CHRISTOPHERS: E. Husselman, *Kalilah and Dimnah* (8s. 6d.), (Studies and Documents X.).

COBDEN-SANDERSON: W. Force Stead, *The Poetry of the Bible* (7s. 6d.).

COLDWELL: *The Rich and the Poor: A Biblical Anthology* (1s.).

KEGAN PAUL: K. Britton, *Communication: A Philosophical Study of Language* (12s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: W. Temple, *Readings in St John's Gospel.* First Series: Chapters I—XII (8s. 6d.).

J. C. B. MOHR (TÜBINGEN): L. Fendt, *Die Bedeutung der wissenschaftlichen Theologie für das practische Leben;* E. Seeberg, *Krisis der Kirche und des Christentumsleute* (M. 1.50 each).

MOWBRAYS: H. de Candole, *The Church's Prayers* (1s. 6d.).

NISBET: F. R. Barry, *Convictions* (2s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: J. Middleton Murry, *Studies in Keats, New and Old* (8s. 6d.); J. L. Stocks, *Reason and Intuition* (12s. 6d.).

RICH AND COWAN: Lindsay Dewar (Ed.), *Training in Prayer* (3s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: Christopher Dawson, *Beyond Politics* (3s. 6d.); Comte du Plessis, *The Human Caravan* (10s. 6d.).

SKEFFINGTON: D. C. Tibbenham, *Further Ten Minute Sermons* (3s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Sir William Bragg, Sir Walter Moberly, Lord Kennet, *Moral Rearmament;* Leslie S. Hunter, *A Church Militant* (1s. each).

S.P.C.K.: Eyre Chatterton, *Alex Wood, Bishop of Nagpur* (3s. 6d.); F. L. Cirlot, *The Early Eucharist* (12s. 6d.); Spencer Elliott, *When Trouble Comes* (4s.); H. E. Symonds, C.R., *The Church Universal and the See of Rome* (12s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. AND S.P.G.: H. P. Thompson, *Canadian Journey* (1s.).

VERLAG DER BONIFACIUS-DRÜCKEREI, PADERBORN: H. Elters, *Die Kirchenordnung Hippolyts von Rom* (M. 14.25).

WORLD STUDENT CHRISTIAN FEDERATION, GENEVA: *Venite Adoremus* (Prayer Book).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher